S·P·Q·R· ROMA·CAPVD·MVNDI

Property of
WILLIAM and FLORA RICHARDSON
LIBRARY

Michael Murin

GREGOROVIUS'

HISTORY OF THE CITY OF ROME IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

VOL. III.

GEORGE BELL AND SONS
LONDON: YORK ST. COVENT GARDEN
CAMBRIDGE: DEIGHTON, BELL & CO.
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.
BOMBAY: A. H. WHEELER & CO.

HISTORY

OF

THE CITY OF ROME

IN THE

MIDDLE AGES

BY

FERDINAND GREGOROVIUS

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH GERMAN EDITION

BY

MRS GUSTAVUS W. HAMILTON

VOL. III.

A.D. 800–1002

SECOND EDITION, REVISED

LONDON
GEORGE BELL & SONS
1903

CONTENTS.

BOOK V.

THE CITY OF ROME IN THE CAROLINGIAN PERIOD UNTIL THE YEAR 900.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

1. Altered Attitude of Rome to the World—Relations of Emperor and Pope to Rome—Leo again journeys to Charles—Ardulf of Northumberland in Rome, . . 1

2. Death of Pipin, 810 — Bernard, King of Italy — Lewis I. crowned at Aachen as Co-Emperor of the Romans—Death of Charles the Great—His Importance in Universal History—Dearth of Local Traditions concerning him in Rome, ... 15

3. Tumults in Rome—Bernard sent to investigate the Causes—Death of Leo III., 816—His Buildings in Rome—Character of contemporary Architecture and Art—The titular Churches and the principal Convents, . . 22

4. Stephen IV., Pope—His Journey to Lewis—His sudden Death—Election and Ordination of Paschalis I.—The Privilegium of Lewis, ... 33

CHAPTER II.

1. Lothar Co-Emperor—Rebellion and Fall of King Bernard—Lothar, King of Italy—His Coronation in Rome—He establishes his Imperial Tribunal there—Action against Farfa—Execution of Roman Nobles—Paschalis evades the Imperial Sentence—His Death, . . . 39

PAGE

2. Paschalis builds the Churches of S. Cecilia in Trastevere, S. Prassede on the Esquiline, S. Maria in Domnica on the Coelian, ... 48

3. Eugenius II., Pope—Lothar comes to Rome—His Constitution of the Year 824—Death of Eugenius, August 827, . 56

4. Valentinus I., Pope—Gregory IV., Pope—The Saracens invade the Mediterranean and found their Kingdom in Sicily—Gregory IV. builds New Ostia—Fall of Charles's Monarchy—Death of Lewis the Pious—Lothar sole Emperor—Partition of Verdun, 843, . . . 65

5. Mania for Relics—The Bodies of Saints—Their removal—Character of the Pilgrimages of the Ninth Century—Gregory IV. rebuilds the Basilica of S. Mark—Restores the Aqua Sabbatina—Builds the Papal Villa Draco—His Death in 844, ... 72

CHAPTER III.

1. Sergius II., Pope—King Lewis comes to Rome—His Coronation—His Differences with the Pope and the Romans—Siconolf in Rome—The Saracens attack and plunder S. Peter's and S. Paul's—Death of Sergius, 847, . 83

2. Leo IV. becomes Pope—Fire in the Borgo—League of Rome, Naples, Amalfi, and Gaeta against the Saracens—Naval Victory at Ostia, 849—Leo IV. builds the Civitas Leonina—Its Walls and Gates—Verses over its chief Gates, 91

3. Leo IV. fortifies Portus, and entrusts the care of the Harbour to a Colony of Corsicans—Builds Leopolis near Centumcellae—Civita Vecchia—Restores Horta and Ameria—Builds Churches in Rome—His votive Gifts—Wealth of the Treasury of the Church—Frascati, . . 101

4. Lewis II. crowned Emperor—Deposition of Cardinal Anastasius—Ethelwolf and Alfred in Rome—Trial of Daniel, the Magister Militum, before the Tribunal of Lewis II.—Death of Leo IV., 855—Fable of Pope Joan, . . 107

CHAPTER IV.

PAGE

1. Benedict III. elected Pope—Tumult in Rome on account of the Election—Invasion of Cardinal Anastasius—Firmness of the Romans towards the Imperial Legates—Benedict III. ordained September 29th, 855—Lewis II. sole Emperor — Friendly relations between Rome and Byzantium, ... 115

2. Nicholas I., Pope—He reduces the Archbishop of Ravenna to subjection—The Greek Schism of Photius breaks out—Relations of Rome to the Bulgarians—Visit of the Envoys of King Boris to Rome—Formosus goes as Missionary to Bulgaria—Attempt to make the Country a Province of the Roman Church—The Bulgarian Constitution of Nicholas I., ... 120

3. Dispute concerning Waldrada—Nicholas condemns the Synod of Metz, and deposes Gunther of Cologne and Theutgaud of Treves — Lewis II. comes to Rome—Excesses of his Troops in the City—Defiance of the German Archbishops — Firmness and victory of the Pope, ... 129

4. Nicholas's care for the City—He restores the Jovia and Trajana—He fortifies Ostia anew—His few Buildings and votive Gifts — Condition of Learning — Lothar's Edict concerning Schools, 825—Decrees of Eugenius II. and Leo IV. regarding the Parochial Schools—Greek Monks in Rome—The Libraries—The Manuscripts—Coins, ... 136

5. Ignorance in Rome—the *Liber Pontificalis* of Anastasius —Its origin and character—Translations of Anastasius from the Greek—Life of Gregory the Great by Johannes Diaconus, ... 145

CHAPTER V.

1. Rise of Papal Supremacy—The Ecclesiastical State—The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals—Death of Nicholas I., 867—Adrian II.—Lambert of Spoleto attacks Rome—The Enemies of Adrian in Rome—Outrages of Eleutherius and Anastasius, and their punishment, . . . 151

PAGE

2. Renewed Controversy regarding Waldrada—Lothar's Perjury —His humiliating Reception in Rome—His sudden Death — Lewis in Lower Italy — Conception of the Imperium at this time—Lewis's Letter to the Emperor of Byzantium—The Empire disgraced by the Surprise in Benevento—Lewis comes to Rome—Is crowned again—The Romans proclaim Adalgisus of Benevento an Enemy to the Republic, ... 161

3. John VIII., Pope, 872—Death of Lewis II.—The Sons of Lewis of Germany and Charles the Bald contend for the Possession of Italy—Charles the Bald, Emperor, 875—Decay of the Imperial Power in Rome—Charles the Bald, King of Italy—The German Faction in Rome—Excesses of the Nobility—Formosus of Portus, . . . 170

4. The Saracens devastate the Campagna—John's Letters of Complaint—League between the Saracens and the Seaports of Southern Italy—Energy of John VIII.—He forms a Fleet, negotiates with the Princes of South Italy, defeats the Saracens at the Cape of Circe—Condition of Southern Italy—John VIII. builds Johannipolis beside S. Paul's, ... 178

CHAPTER VI.

1. Difficult position of John VIII. towards Lambert and the Emperor—He again confirms Charles the Bald in the Imperial Dignity—Synods of Rome and Ravenna, 877—Decrees of John concerning the Patrimonies—Papal Exchequer Lands—Unavailing attempts to avert Feudalism—Death of Charles the Bald—Triumph of the German Party—Threatening Attitude of Lambert and the Exiles—Lambert attacks Rome and takes the Pope Prisoner—John VIII. escapes to France, . . 188

2. John at the Synod of Troyes—He favours Duke Boso—Accompanies him to Lombardy—Failure of his Plans—Charles the Fat becomes King of Italy, and is crowned Emperor in Rome in 881—End of John VIII.—His ambitious Projects—His Character, . . . 198

3. Marinus I., Pope—He restores Formosus—Overthrows Guido of Spoleto—Adrian III., Pope, 884—The Decrees falsely attributed to him—Stephen V., Pope—Custom of Sacking the Patriarchium on the Death of a Pope—Luxury of the Bishops—Famine in Rome—Deposition and Death of Charles the Fat—End of the Carolingian Empire—Struggle between Berengar and Guido for the Crown—Guido restores the Frankish Empire, 891—Death of Stephen V., ... 205

PAGE

CHAPTER VII.

1. Formosus, Pope, 891—The Factions of Arnulf and Guido—The Rival Candidate Sergius—Formosus summons Arnulf to march on Rome—Arnulf in Italy—Death of Guido—Lambert Emperor—Arnulf advances against Rome—Takes the City by storm—Is crowned Emperor, April 896—The Romans take the Oath of Fidelity—His disastrous Return—Death of Formosus in May 896, . 216

2. Disorder in Rome—Boniface VI., Pope—Stephen VI., Pope—The Corpse Synod—Judgment pronounced on Formosus—Fall of the Lateran Basilica—Causes of the shocking Sacrilege—The Libellus of Auxilius—The Invective against Rome—Terrible end of Stephen VI., . 224

3. Romanus, Pope—Theodorus II., Pope—Attempt of Sergius to seize the Papacy on the Death of Theodorus; he is banished—John IX., Pope, 898—His Decree regarding the Papal Consecration—His efforts to strengthen the Empire of Lambert—Death of Lambert—Berengar, King of Italy—the Hungarians in Italy—Lewis of Provence, Pretender—Death of John IX. in July 900, . . 230

BOOK VI.

History of the City in the Tenth Century.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

1. Benedict IV. crowns Lewis of Provence Emperor, 901—Leading Romans of the Time—Leo V. and Christophorus—Sergius III. becomes Pope—His Bulls—Rebuilds the Lateran Basilica—Anastasius III. and Lando, . . 241
2. John X.—His Past—He owes the Tiara to the Roman Theodora—Theophylact, Husband of Theodora, Consul and Senator of the Romans—The Upstart Alberic—His relations with Marozia—Theodora and Marozia, . . 249
3. Terrible Devastation inflicted by the Saracens—Destruction of Farfa—Subiaco—Saracen Strongholds in the Campagna—John X. offers Berengar the Imperial Crown—Berengar's Entry into Rome—His Coronation early in December 915, ... 259
4. Campaign against the Saracens—Battles in the Sabina and Campagna—Treaty between John X. and the Princes of Southern Italy—Annihilation of the Saracen Forces on the Garigliano in August 916—The Pope and Alberic return to Rome—Position of Alberic—Overthrow of Berengar—Its consequences in Rome—Uncertainty concerning Alberic's end, ... 266
5. Rudolf of Burgundy is driven from the Country—Feminine Intrigues with regard to Hugo—John X. forms a Treaty with him—Marozia marries Guido of Tuscany—Perplexities of John X.—Banishment of his Brother Peter—Revolution in Rome—Murder of Peter—Fall and Death of John X., ... 276

CHAPTER II.

1. Leo VI. and Stephen VII.—The Son of Marozia succeeds to the Papacy as John XI.—King Hugo—Marozia offers him Rome and her Hand—Their Marriage—S. Angelo—Revolution in Rome—The young Alberic seizes the Reins of Power, ... 282

PAGE

2. Character of the Revolution—Alberic *Princeps* and *Senator omnium Romanorum*—Significance of the Title—The Senate—The Senatrices—Foundations of Alberic's Power—The Aristocracy—Position of the Burgher Class—The City Militia—The Judicial System under Alberic, . 291

3. Alberic's Moderation—Hugo repeatedly besieges Rome—His Daughter Alda marries Alberic—Alberic's relations with Byzantium—Leo VII., 936—Retrospect of Benedictine Monasticism—Its Decay—The Reform of Cluny—Alberic's energy regarding it—Odo of Cluny in Rome—Continuation of the History of Farfa—The Sabine Province, ... 302

4. Stephen VIII., Pope, 939—Alberic suppresses a Revolt—Marinus II., Pope, 942—Hugo again lays siege to Rome—He is overthrown by Berengar of Ivrea—Lothar, King of Italy—Peace between Hugo and Alberic—Agapitus II., Pope, 946—Death of Lothar—Berengar, King of Italy, 950—The Italians summon Otto the Great—Alberic refuses to admit him to Rome—Berengar becomes his Vassal—Death of Alberic, 954, ... 317

CHAPTER III.

1. Octavian succeeds Alberic in the Government—He becomes Pope as John XII., 955—His Excesses—He forsakes his Father's policy—The Lombards and John XII. invite Otto I. to Rome—Otto's Treaty with the Pope—His Oath—The Imperial Coronation, February 2, 962—Character of the new Roman Imperium of the German Nation, ... 328

2. Charter of Otto—John and the Romans do homage to the Emperor—John conspires against him—Receives Adalbert in Rome—Otto enters the City and the Pope escapes—The Emperor deprives the Romans of the right of Papal Election—The November Synod—Deposition of John XII.—Leo VIII.—Unsuccessful Revolt of the Romans—Otto leaves Rome, ... 337

3. Return of John XII.—Flight of Leo VIII.—He is deposed by a Council—John's revenge upon his Enemies—His Death, May 964—The Romans elect Benedict V.—Otto conducts Leo VIII. back to Rome—Deposition and Exile of Benedict—The Papacy rendered subject to the German Emperor—Privilegium of Leo VIII., . . . PAGE 350

4. Otto returns to Germany—Death of Leo in the Spring of 965—John XIII., Pope—His Family—His Banishment—Otto marches against Rome—The Pope is again seized—Barbarous punishment of the Rebels — The Caballus Constantini—Lament for the fall of Rome into the power of the Saxons, ... 357

CHAPTER IV.

1. Coronation of Otto II.—Embassy of Liutprand to Byzantium —Praeneste or Palestrina — The Senatrix Stephania receives the Investiture of this City in the year 970, . 368

2. Marriage of Theophano with Otto II. in Rome—Benedict VI., Pope, 973—Death of Otto the Great—Agitation in Rome—Family of the Crescentii—The Caballi Marmorei —Roman Surnames at this period—Crescentius de Theodora—Fall of Benedict VI.—Ferrucius raised to the Papal Chair as Boniface VII.—His sudden Flight—Obscure end of Crescentius, ... 375

3. Benedict VII., Pope, 974—He promotes the Cluniac Reform — Restores Churches and Convents — Monastery of SS. Boniface and Alexius on the Aventine—Legend of S. Alexius—Otto II.'s Italian Expedition—His presence in Rome at Easter, 981—His unfortunate Campaign in Calabria—John XIV. becomes Pope—Death of Otto II. in Rome, December 7, 983—His Tomb in S. Peter's, . 387

4. Ferrucius returns to Rome—Terrible end of John XIV.—Boniface's Reign of Terror—His Overthrow—John XV., Pope, 985—Crescentius seizes the Patrician Power—Theophano comes to Rome as Regent of the Empire—She tranquillises the City—S. Adalbert in Rome, . 396

CHAPTER V.

1. Deeper Decadence of the Papacy—Invective of the Gallic Bishops against Rome—Hostile attitude of the Provincial Synods—Crescentius usurps the Temporal Power—Flight of John XV.—His return to Rome—His Death, 996—Gregory V. the first German Pope—Subjection of the Papacy to the German Empire—Otto III., Emperor, May 21, 996, ... PAGE 404

2. Condemnation of the Roman Rebels—Crescentius is pardoned—Adalbert obliged to leave Rome—His Martyrdom—Otto III. leaves Rome — Rebellion of the Romans—Revolt of the City against Papacy and Empire — Crescentius drives Gregory V. out of the City—Revolution in Rome—Crescentius raises John XVI. to the Papal Chair, ... 413

3. Rule of Crescentius — Otto advances against the City—Horrible fate of the Anti-Pope — Crescentius defends himself in S. Angelo—Varying accounts of his Death—Mons Malus or Monte Mario—Epitaph of Crescentius, . 424

CHAPTER VI.

1. Consequences of the Fall of Crescentius—His Relations in the Sabina—Hugo, Abbot of Farfa—Condition of this Imperial Monastery—Remarkable Lawsuit between the Abbot and the Presbyters of S. Eustachius in Rome, . 435

2. Legal Administration in Rome—The Judices Palatini or Ordinarii—The Judices Dativi—Formula for the Institution of the Roman Judges—Formula for the bestowal of Roman Citizenship — Criminal Judges — Consuls and Comites with Judicial Authority in the Country Towns, . 444

3. The Imperial Palatinate in Rome—Imperial Guard—Count Palatine—Imperial Fiscus—Papal Palatinate and Camera — Taxes — Diminution of the Lateran Revenues — Squandering of the Property of the Church—Exemptions of the Bishops—Recognition of Feudal Contracts by the Roman Church about the year 1000, . . . 451

4. Otto III. goes to Campania—Death of Gregory V. in February 999 — Gerbert — S. Romuald in Ravenna — Gerbert as Sylvester II.—Otto's Visions of a Restoration of the Roman Empire—He adopts the Forms of the Byzantine Court — Book of Court Ceremonial — The Patricius, ... 461

5. Beginning of Sylvester's Pontificate—Donation of Otto III. —Earliest presage of the Crusades—Hungary becomes a Province of the Roman Church—Otto III. on the Aventine—His Mysticism—He returns to Germany—Revisits Italy in the year 1000—Difficult position of Sylvester II. —The Basilica of S. Adalbert on the Island in the Tiber, 474

6. Tibur or Tivoli—Insurrection of this City—Besieged and spared by Otto III. and the Pope—Revolt in Rome—Otto's desperate position—His Speech to the Romans—His Flight from the City—His last Year—His Death on January 23, 1002, ... 484

CHAPTER VII.

1. Barbarism of the Tenth Century—Superstition—Ignorance of the Roman Clergy—Invective of the Gallic Bishops—Remarkable Reply—Decay of Convents and Schools in Rome—Grammar—Traces of Theatrical Performances—The Popular Dialect—Utter dearth of Literary Talent in Rome, ... 497

2. Slow return of Learning — Gregory V. — Genius of Sylvester II., a Foreigner in Rome — Boethius — Italian Historical Writing in the Tenth Century—Benedict of Soracte—The Libellus on the Imperial Power in the City of Rome—The Catalogues of the Popes—The Life of S. Adalbert, ... 509

3. The Descriptions of the City—The *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln —Activity of Legend and Tradition in Rome—The Sounding Statues on the Capitol—The Legend of the building of the Pantheon—The *Graphia* of the Golden City of Rome—The Memoria Julii Caesaris, . . 516

4. The Regions of the City in the Tenth Century—The Streets—Architecture—Description of a Palace—Great number of imposing Ruins—Devastation of Rome by the Romans, . PAGE 529

5. Walk through the City in the Time of Otto III. — The Palatine — The Septizonium — The Forum — SS. Sergius and Bacchus — The Infernus—Marforio — The Capitol—S. Mario in Capitolio—Campus Caloleonis—The Column of Trajan—The Column of Marcus Aurelius —Campo Marzo—Mons Augustus—The Navona—The Churches belonging to Farfa—S. Eustachius in Platana—Legend of S. Eustachius—S. Maria in the Minervium—Camigliano — Arcus Manus Carneae — Parione — The Bridges over the Tiber—Temples of Fortuna Virilis and Vesta—Concluding Remarks, ... 540

BOOK FIFTH.

THE CITY OF ROME IN THE CAROLINGIAN PERIOD UNTIL THE YEAR 900.

HISTORY OF THE CITY OF ROME IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

CHAPTER I.

1. Altered Attitude of Rome to the World—Relations of Emperor and Pope to Rome—Leo again journeys to Charles—Ardulf of Northumberland in Rome.

Charles derived the title of his Empire from Rome, but the material which filled the ancient form had become essentially Teutonic; and in calling the New Empire the Germanic-Roman we but give expression to the alliance of those opposing elements on which the development of Europe rested. One nationality continued the history of mankind as an unbroken inheritance; it handed the possessions of the ancient civilisation, together with the ideas of Christianity, on to posterity;—the other received and resuscitated or developed both civilisation and religion. Rome had drawn the German world to herself. The Roman Church had subdued barbarism, had brought nations under a social system, and lastly, had united them to a common ecclesiastical-political principle, which had

its seat in the Eternal City. On Byzantium now seemed to be laid the task of accomplishing the like work for the Slav nations; the task, however, remained unfulfilled, because the Byzantine Empire lacked the creative social principle possessed by the Roman Church, and also because the Slav races, unfitted for the higher ideas of the State and of civilisation, remained incapable of receiving the inheritance of Hellenic culture. The thought of a Slavic-Greek Empire still lingers in Russia, not, however, as the national object of an imperfect development, but rather as the consciousness of a neglected historic opportunity which it is now no longer possible to revive.

While Byzantium was thus banished from the history of the West, Rome for the second time entered on a splendid position among the nations of the world. After the Rome of the Caesars had destroyed the political autonomy of nations, new States had arisen through the various migrations of the peoples, and the Church had proclaimed the moral equality of races, or their Christian citizenship. The ideal of a single and indivisible humanity, of the Christian republic, now appeared as the thought of a new age. The ancient capital of the restored Empire, the Apostolic centre of the Church, called herself the mother of Christian nations, and represented herself to the moral *Orbis Terrarum* as the *Civitas Dei*. The first imperfect outline of a society of nations united by means of a moral idea had been advanced, but this "Holy Empire" had yet to take form; and the entire Middle Ages were, as even the present time is, nothing more than a continued struggle to

give a living form to the sublime Christian ideal of the love and liberty which encompass the world.

The city likewise received a new significance within the narrower circle of her history. Her escape from the repeated attacks of the barbarians, and her final rescue from the hands of Lombards and Greeks, was a fact of historic importance. After Pipin and Charles had put an end to the final struggle of the Germans for Rome, they drew a line round the emancipated city and made the Pope lord of all the territory within. The Frankish King, the new Emperor, vowed as overlord to defend this ecclesiastical State dedicated to S. Peter against all foes, within and without, for no prince or people could exclusively possess Rome—the common property of mankind. In a higher sense than ancient Rome, the Metropolis of Christendom represented a universal principle. She must, therefore, be free and accessible to all nations alike; the High Priest within her should be subject to no king, but the supreme head of the Empire and of the Church—that is to say, to the Emperor. It was this idea of Rome's neutrality as the ecclesiastical centre of nations, up to which the waves of humanity, ceaselessly stirred by political and social storms, should never advance, that succeeded in preserving the little State of the Church for the Pope until our own day, while Charles's great monarchy and a hundred kingdoms around fell to dust. Who can deny that the idea of a sacred metropolis, a temple of eternal peace in the midst of struggling humanity, a universal asylum of culture, of law, and of reconciliation is great and admirable?

Had the institution of the Papacy but remained devoid of ambition and worldly desire, had it escaped dogmatic stagnation, and advanced with the development of a widening life, with the social forces of the world and the discoveries of toil and culture, it would have constituted almost the highest cosmic form, in which mankind should have seen the expression of its unity and harmony. After the expiration of its first and most glorious period, however, the Papacy became the essentially retarding principle in the drama of history. The greatest idea latent in the Church never attained fulfilment; but that it had once existed in the Papacy serves to make the Papacy the most venerable of all institutions which history has beheld, and that the city of Rome was the classic receptacle of this idea suffices to secure for her the everlasting love of mankind.

Rome for the second time became the legitimate source of the Empire. The great traditions of the Roman Empire as of the political order of the world, were there preserved; Charles called himself therefore Emperor of the Romans, since there was no other Empire than that, the origin and conception of which were allied with Rome. On this account the Byzantine rulers also continue to call themselves Roman Emperors. Rome, it is true, was politically a lifeless ruin, but the possession of the city by Charles was equal to the possession of a legal diploma, genuine and hallowed by antiquity. Nevertheless, the claim of Rome to be still the root of the Empire would have been nothing more than an antiquarian recollection had the Church not restored the conception of universality. By means of this idea Rome governed the

ancient provinces of the Caesars before Charles received the Imperial crown, through which he again united these provinces in an Empire. The unity of the ancient Empire was based essentially upon Roman law, but in the new the like unity was attained by the code of ecclesiastical law. Hierarchical claims replaced the political rights which the city no longer possessed, and the Popes strove rapidly to remove the semblance of sovereignty which the Roman people had exercised on the occasion of Charles's election. They represented the German Caesar as the vassal of the Church, the Empire as the emanation of the Divine Will ratified by the papal unction. Did the Romans of Charles's day but reflect on the dominion which their city exercised on the most distant countries by means of the system of the Church, by the universal application of the Roman Canon, by the introduction of the Latin tongue in schools, churches, synods, and secular transactions, and lastly, by the remains of classic learning and art, they must have acknowledged to themselves that, although widely different in nature, this dominion was scarcely inferior to the dominion of Trajan.

Meanwhile, Rome was only the ideal head of the Empire, circumstances fortunately for mankind never allowing the city to become again its political centre. Had it again attained this position, Empire and Papacy together would have formed an illimitable power, and Europe would have been swallowed in a hierarchical despotism more formidable than the ancient despotism of the Caesars. Charles renounced the idea of making Rome the capital of his monarchy,

and this renunciation was one of the most momentous actions in the record of history. The independent development of the Western nations, and finally that of the Church, were thereby rendered possible. The forged donation of Constantine had truly anticipated the consequences in store for the Papacy, if the head of the Empire again made his residence in Rome. The most imminent danger threatened the Roman bishopric at the moment of the restoration of the Imperium, but happily for the bishopric the peril was averted. The opposition which existed between German and Roman elements divided for ever Imperial and papal power; and the antagonism between the two forces, which mutually curbed and limited one another, preserved the freedom of Europe. For, as the new Emperor was the product of the conquering energy of the German race, and the Pope a creation of Rome and the Latin race, it followed that these two national elements should further mould these two universal forces in themselves; that the North should develop the political, the South the spiritual institutions, Germany the Empire, Rome the Church. The West, according to Charles's design, was to have two centres, round which the great system of the Christian republic should revolve — the papal city and the Imperial city, Rome and Aachen; while he, the Emperor, was to remain sole head of the Universal Empire and the Church.[1]

[1] Rome was called head and fortress of the Empire; thus the Diaconus Florus in his *querela de divisione Imperii post mortem Ludovici Pii* (*Dom. Bouquet*, vii. 302) exclaims:

O fortunatum, nosset sua si bona, regnum,
Cujus Roma arx est.

Inward opposition, however, and the force of German individuality, which opposed the sentiment of liberty and the obstinacy of individual independence to the Roman principles of authority and system, soon shattered Charles's fabric, and the Papacy rapidly fell from the pinnacle to which the pious monarch had raised it. The Germans struggled against Roman and Latin influences. In the city itself a violent conflict arose between civic aspirations and ecclesiastical immunities, and the history of the two memorable centuries contained in this volume reveals the most glaring opposition in the life of Rome until the tenth century closes with that period when the Saxons raise the Papacy from the deplorable ruin into which it had fallen, and restore Charles's shattered system in a copy from which, however, the theocratic ideas have gradually disappeared before the Imperialism of ancient Rome.

Charles spends the winter (800–801) in Rome.

Charles spent the winter following his coronation in Rome, dwelling not in the ancient Palatium, which he left to its decay, but in one of the episcopal buildings (which he converted into a palace) beside S. Peter's. All the Carolingians who came to Rome made their abode in this quarter, and here the Imperial Legate also dwelt. The distance of Germany, and the resolve not to make his residence in Rome, prevented Charles from building any new Imperial fortress. Had he built a palace of the kind, chroniclers would not have failed to mention and describe it, as they have described the palaces of Aachen and Ingelheim.[1]

[1] The palace beside S. Peter's is mentioned in *Regest. Farf.* n. 537 : *ad basil. b. Petri Ap. in palatio d. Karoli.* A diploma Ludov. II. *A.*

He regulates civic affairs.

The Emperor set the affairs of Italy and the city in order. He tranquillised the city and made it subject to Imperial rule. He compelled the Romans to acknowledge the Pope as their territorial ruler, while, at the same time, as Imperial vassals (*homines imperiales*) they took the oath of fidelity and obedience to himself. Nevertheless, the Imperial power existed only as a principle in Rome. In an age which although rude was far removed from the system of absolute monarchy, and especially under the curious twofold system of the political-ecclesiastical organisation, the restored Imperial power was not felt either in taxation or in forced military service, but, with the exception of a few royal prerogatives, found its sole expression in the administration of law as the highest conception of civil life. The Pope appointed his judices, but the Emperor was the supreme legal authority. This authority was represented by his Missus or Legate, who, as often as he was sent to Rome, lived at the expense of the papal chamber beside S. Peter's. Here, or in the Hall of the Lateran, known as "the Hall of the She-wolf," he held his sessions (*placita*).[1] He defended the Pope against

His Legate in Rome.

872 (*Chron. Farf.*) says: *Acta in civitate Roma, Palatio Imperatoris*, which corresponds to *Actum apud S. Petrum*. The *Libell. de Imp. Potes.* expressly says of the Imperial Missus: *morabatur quippe in palatio S. Petri.*

[1] *Libellus de Imperatoria Potestate in Urbe Roma: Inventum est, ut omnes majores Romae essent imperiales homines, et ut suus missus omni tempore moraretur Romae.* The *Libellus*, compiled by an Imperialist about the year 950, disputes the claims of the Pope to territorial supremacy, and is the writing of a partisan. That Charles's Legate constantly resided in Rome is asserted only by this document. Ferd. Hirsch considers the assertion very questionable, since there were only

the attacks of the nobility, but at the same time watched over Imperial rights within the city. He presided at tribunals, appropriated the fines to the Fiscus, superintended the papal judges in the city and duchy, received appeals from the sentences of these judges and reported them to the Emperor. In important cases the Emperor sent an extraordinary Missus to Rome, and persons guilty of high treason, Roman nobles and bishops, were tried before one of these envoys, usually the Duke of Spoleto. The offenders were occasionally sent into exile beyond the Alps, as formerly under Byzantine rule they had been sent to some part of Greece. The Legate of the Emperor was, moreover, his plenipotentiary at the ordination of a Pope, a ceremony which the Legate was obliged to attend. For, although the papal election was free, the decree of election was apparently henceforward sent to the Emperor, and his sanction thus obtained.

Coins testify to the Emperor's supremacy over Rome and the ecclesiastical State. The type of the Roman coinage in its main features was evidently fixed between Charles and Leo III. after the Imperial coronation. The Emperor now either recognised the Pope's right of coinage, or, together with the immunity with which he invested the Roman bishop, conceded him this right. Leo III., therefore, as evidence of his territorial supremacy, caused his own name to be engraved on one side of the Roman denarius; on

itinerant regal envoys in the provinces. (*Die Schenkung Kaiser Carl's des Kahlen für Papst Johann VIII. und der Lib. de imp. pot. Forsch. z. deutsch Gesch.* XX. 1880.)

the other, however, the name of his overlord, the Emperor.[1] We thus find repeated almost the same relations as those which had existed between the Byzantine Imperial authority and the Gothic kings of Italy, who had the obverse of their coins engraved with the head of the Emperor, the reverse with their own. And as long as the Carolingian Empire retained its power, the essential Imperial rights in Rome, the highest legal authority and the recognition of the papal election were thus continually asserted.

If the political authority of the new Emperor is clear to us, the relation of the Pope as territorial ruler to the city remains somewhat obscure. We know nothing of the civic constitution of the time, and nothing of the liberties of the nobles (apparently adjusted by a stipulation) and their rights to a share in the temporal government; nothing of the system of justice, which lay primarily in the hands of the nobility, since the prelates had not yet monopolised the management of all secular concerns. The restoration of the Empire must necessarily have been followed by a municipal reorganisation of the city, which probably included a fresh division of the military districts and the regions. The silence of historians and of the archives, however, leaves us in ignorance on these questions.

Charles prudently did not allow himself to be dazzled by visions of conquest in the South. Had he but cherished that adventurous longing for the East

[1] S PETRUS round the edge, in the field LEO PA—CARLUS round the edge, in the field IPA. For the type of Roman coins see my treatise "Die Münzen Alberichs," *Sitzg. der b. Ak. d. Wiss.* 1885.

which later times have attributed to him, his arms might easily have extended the limits of the Western Empire to the Ionian Sea; nor would the Byzantine fleet have sufficed to defend Greece. His mission, however, drew him instead to the North and West, where he had to seek the centre of gravity of his State. He therefore surrendered the kingdom of Italy to his son Pipin, made over to him the war with Benevento, and left Rome after Easter (April 25th, 801) to return to Germany. He was startled at Spoleto, on the last day of April, by an earthquake, the shock of which was felt as far as the Rhineland. Italy had to mourn the ruin of some cities, and in Rome several ancient buildings must have perished. Contemporary writers, however, scarcely bestow a glance on the monuments of antiquity; whilst almost all, Germans as well as Italians, speak of the destruction of the roof of the basilica of S. Paul as of an important event.[1]

Pipin, King of Italy, 801.

The Emperor went to Ravenna, thence to Pavia, the capital of the Italian kingdom, and there added some Chartularies to the code of Lombard laws. He herein styled himself "Charles, by the will of God, Ruler of the Empire of the Romans, most Serene Augustus," and appended to his edicts the date of the consulate.[2]

Charles in Ravenna, 801.

[1] *Lib. Pont.* in Leone III. c. 31. *Annal Einh.* 801. *Annal. Fuld. Poeta Saxo*, &c. Galletti erroneously ascribed to Leo III. the inscription in the cloister of S. Paul's where Leo I. speaks of the falling-in and restoration of the basilica (*Inscr.* i. 21). Charles was in Bologna on May 29, 801: Sickel, *Regesten der Urkunden der ersten Carolinger*, Vienna, 1867, on this date.

[2] *Anno—consulatus autem nostri primo.* The Carolingians also noted the Post-consulate: *Imp. Dnn. pp. Aug. Hludowico a Deo coronato magno pacifico Imp. a. sexto et PC. ejus a. sexto. . . .*

The Court in Constantinople was loud in indignation against both Franks and Romans. It saw its legitimate rights overthrown by a bold barbarian king, who assumed the title of Emperor of the Romans, a title which belonged to the heirs of Constantine alone. But the Frankish power was formidable, the weakness of the Byzantine great, and the tottering throne was still occupied by a woman. Irene, surrounded by rebels, sought Charles's friendship. She found herself almost reduced to the same extremities as those which had once compelled the Gothic Queen Amalasuntha to seek refuge with the foes of her race. The extravagant project of a marriage between Charles and the Empress, by which the Eastern and Western Empires should have been united in the Frankish dynasty, was impracticable. To Charles, however, it was above all necessary to have the respective claims and frontiers of Franks and Byzantines in Italy determined by treaty. He therefore received Irene's ambassadors, and sent his own to Constantinople. But his envoys only arrived at the Byzantine Court to witness the overthrow of the Empress. Nicephorus, previously Treasurer of the Palace, seized the purple in a bloodless revolution (31st October 802), and banished Irene to the Island of Lesbos. The usurper was no less anxious to conciliate the friendship of the hated Franks. He lent a willing ear to the ambassadors, and on their return sent ministers of his own back with them to Charles. After the execution of a treaty the ambassadors returned to Constantinople by way of Rome. The Pope also desired to see relations adjusted between the rival courts, in order to

Nicephorus, Emperor of Byzantium, 802.

avert the danger of a war; and, since he sent his Legates to Constantinople, may not only have wished to effect a peace, but also to justify himself with regard to Charles's coronation. Concerning the difficult negotiations between Rome and Byzantium, however, we are entirely ignorant.

Leo journeys to Charles, 804.

Impelled by urgent reasons, Leo III. undertook another journey to Charles in 804. The Pope must have already suffered various acts of interference on the part of the King of Italy in the property of the Church, must have been irritated by the authoritative attitude assumed by the Imperial envoys towards the Papal duces in the Pentapolis. The demeanour of the Romans must also have given him cause for anxiety.[1] When, in the middle of November, the Emperor heard of the Pope's journey, he sent his son Charles to receive him at S. Maurice; he himself went to meet Leo at Rheims.

Together they celebrated Christmas at Kiersey, whence Charles conducted his guest to Aachen. Here he dismissed him laden with gifts, and commanded some of his nobles to escort him through Bavaria on his way to Ravenna. In January Leo was again in Rome. He had not attained all his desires; for the dispute concerning the frontiers of his property, or those between Imperial supremacy and the papal territorial power remained to be the subject of lasting dissensions, while the exorbitant de-

[1] Leo's letters of this year have not been preserved. Of his ten letters (Cenni, *Monum.* ii.) the first belongs to the year 806, in the succeeding we find the complaints which have been noted. With regard to the Pope's journey: *Annales Einh.*, *Fuld.*, *Amandi*, *Juvav.*, *Lauriss*

mands of S. Peter awoke the indignation of the youthful Pipin. These demands interfered with the realisation of Pipin's own design, that of founding a powerful Italian kingdom; and even if not sufficiently far-sighted to detect the seeds of the lasting disunion of this country which lay concealed within his ancestor's donation, Pipin properly already deplored that ancestor's generosity.

Charles's division of the Empire, 806.

In 806 Pipin received fresh confirmation in his Italian kingdom. Charles, advancing in years, recognised the impossibility of preserving the unity of his vast kingdom under one sceptre. He feared a quarrel between his heirs, and unfortunately decided to divide the monarchy between his three sons. He did honour to the Pope in sending him the deed of partition by Eginhard that it might receive the Church's sanction.[1] In consequence of this deed, Pipin announced his approaching visit. He did not come, but another king appeared in his place. Ardulf of Northumberland, driven by a powerful party from his throne and kingdom in 808, fled to Charles's court at Nimwegen to implore the Frankish monarch to aid in his restoration. With Charles's consent he hastened to Rome to beg the support of the Pope. Leo sent the Saxon Adolf, his deacon and nuncio, to escort the fugitive back to England, where two Imperial Legates succeeded in placing the prince again upon the throne.[2] Rome, it

[1] *Annal. Einh. ad A.* 806: *divisio Imperii* in the Capitular. *Mon. Germ.* iii. 140. Muratori shows from this that Modena, Reggio, Parma, Piacenza belonged to the kingdom of Italy, and not to the Exarchate.

[2] *Annal. Einh.* and *Fuld. ad A.* 808; Leo's Letters, 5, 6, 7, in Cenni.

is true, had already beheld kings, more especially from the British Isles, come to take the cowl. Ardulf was the first, however, to sue in the Lateran for the restoration of the crown of which he had been deprived. The instance shows the views which were arising in the West concerning papal authority. And since, after Pipin's days, it was kings themselves who, for the sake of temporal advantage, exalted the conception of the Roman episcopate in the eyes of peoples and princes, we cannot be surprised that these bishops, renouncing the idea of spiritual intercession, soon arrogated to themselves the divine power of giving and removing crowns.

2. Death of Pipin, 810—Bernard, King of Italy—Lewis I. crowned at Aachen as co-Emperor of the Romans—Death of Charles the Great—His Importance in Universal History—Dearth of Local Traditions concerning him in Rome.

The house of Charles, the fate of which is so closely interwoven with the history of the city, was scarcely less unfortunate than the house of Augustus. The founder of a new Imperial dynasty saw his favourite children snatched away during his life-time. Pipin, thirty-two years of age, died in Milan on July 8, 810. His scheme for uniting Italy by the conquest of Venetia and Benevento remained unfulfilled, and from his death-bed he looked with anxiety on the tender years of his only and illegitimate son. Charles nominated the youthful Bernard King of Italy, but his

Death of King Pipin, July 8, 810.

Bernard, King of Italy.

formal investiture did not take place until 813; meanwhile, in 812, the boy was sent under the escort of Wala, grandson of Charles Martel, and Wala's brother Adelhard, Abbot of Corvei, to Pavia, where it was intended that he should remain under the guidance of these distinguished men.[1] The Emperor had again been sorely stricken by the death of his son Charles. In his loneliness, and with the prospect of death before his eyes, he resolved to appoint Lewis of Aquitaine, the sole heir of his monarchy, joint-Emperor of the Romans with himself. With the consent of the nobles of his Empire he invested Lewis with the Imperial dignity at Aachen, September 11, 813. Frankish historians assert that Charles either handed Lewis the crown, placed it on his head, or ordered him to take it with his own hands from the altar and himself to set it on his head.[2] The parliament consisted of the chief Frankish nobles and clergy assembled from all parts of the Empire. Lewis was consequently proclaimed Emperor by a unanimous act of election, but the manner of this election was entirely different from that of his father. Charles's election had taken place in Rome, and although the "Senate of the Franks" had borne a part, the leading rôle had fallen to the Romans and to the Pope, by whom the coronation had been solemnised. The elevation of Charles to the dignity of *Imperator Romanorum* had consequently appeared an act essentially of the will

Lewis co-Emperor, Sept. 11, 813.

[1] The year 812 is vouched for by the *Annal. Einh.*, *Lauriss. min.*, *Xant.*; 813 by the same source, and also Thegani, *Vita Ludov.*

[2] *Tunc jussit eum pater, ut propriis manibus elevasset coronam, quae erat super altare, et capiti suo imponeret.* Thegani, *Vita*, c. 6.

of the Romans, and of the consecration by the Pope, and in later times was expressly so regarded.[1] The election of a Caesar at Aachen, on the other hand, proceeded from the consent of the parliament of the already founded monarchy, and neither the Pope nor any bishop representing him anointed or crowned the candidate. With his own hand the son set the father's crown upon his head. No Roman is mentioned as among the bystanders; and if envoys of the Pope, if duces and bishops from Roman territory were present, they, like the counts and prelates of the kingdom of Italy, were mingled in the general diet of the Empire. Charles looked on the city of Rome, the source of the Imperium, as comprised within his Empire like Pavia, Milan or Aquileja. The powerful Emperor accordingly opposed the pretensions of the Pope. He intended the brilliant moment at Aachen to serve as a direct hint to his successors. Had but his feeble descendants been able to understand it, the history both of the Papacy and of the Empire might easily have taken a different course. We shall see, however, that the German act of election vanished amid the current of dogmatic opinions of the time without leaving any trace. The same assembly of the Empire likewise ratified the appointment of Bernard, Pipin's son, as King of Italy.

[1] Letter of Lewis II. to the Emperor Basil: *qui nisi Romanorum Imp. essemus, utique nec Francorum. A Romanis enim hoc nomen et dignitatem assumsimus, apud quos . . . primo tantae culmen sublimitatis . . . effulsit, quocumque gentem et Urbem divinitus gubernandam, et matrem omnium Ecclesiarum Dei defendendam—suscepimus. Anon. Salern.* c. 102.

Death of Charles the Great, Jan. 28, 814.

Charles the Great, sage and hero, died a few months later at Aachen, on January 28, 814, at the age of seventy-one. The restorer of the Roman Empire was buried in the Church of S. Maria which he had built, and an ancient Roman sarcophagus, chiselled with the Rape of Proserpine, apparently served as his coffin.[1] If we compare one with another, the three periods of Roman history which will ever stand conspicuous as summits in the life of the people—the period of Caesar and Augustus, when the Roman world-monarchy was founded; that of Constantine, when Christianity rose to dominion; and finally, the age of Charles, when the system of Germanic-Roman civilisation arose out of the ruin of the ancient Empire—we shall find that the third does not yield in importance to either of the other two. Charles's age was fertile in new forms of life, and truly creative. It closed the period of barbarian migrations and reconciled the Germans with Rome. It did not allow antiquity—the buried treasure-chamber of knowledge and culture—to be lost to impoverished humanity; but, laying prejudice aside, began to revivify it and adopt it as an essential and imperishable force in the process of intellectual development. The great tradition of the *Orbis Terrarum*, or of the unity of the world, formerly the political end and aim of the Roman Empire of the Caesars, which arose contemporaneously with Christianity, was revived in the age of Charles the Great. This age transformed the

[1] In such a marble sarcophagus the body of Charles was discovered in the year 1165, during the reign of Frederick I. Simson, *Jahrb. d. Fränk. Reichs unter Karl dem Groszen*, ii. 537.

ancient Imperium into the Western monarchy, which found its inmost bond of cohesion in the principle of the Christian religion. Charles was the Moses of the Middle Ages, who successfully led mankind through the deserts of barbarism and bestowed on them a new code of political, ecclesiastical, and civil constitutions. In his theocratic Empire was exhibited the first attempt to establish the new federation of nations in the form of a Christian republic.

The Emperor bequeathed a portion of his treasures to the twenty-one metropolitan churches of the Empire. Five of these churches were in Italy: Rome, Ravenna, Milan, Aquileja and Grado. Two silver tables—one square, and adorned with a relief of Constantinople, the other round, with a representation of Rome—formed part of the curiosities of the Imperial palace. The former of these tables Charles presented to S. Peter's, the latter to the Church of Ravenna. Both monuments of early mediæval art have perished. The table presented to Rome remains unnoticed in the life of Leo III., although the *Liber Pontificalis* makes frequent mention of a large gold cross, another of the Emperor's votive gifts. The table, however, with the relief of Rome, which, following the instructions of his father's will, the Emperor Lewis sent to the Archbishop Martin, reached Ravenna during the boyhood of Agnellus, and was seen by the historian.[1]

[1] Agnellus, *Vita Martini*, c. 2: *mensam argenteam unam absque ligno, habentem infra se anagliphte totam Romam.* Eginh. *Vita*, at the end: *decrevit, ut una ex his, que forma quadrangula, description. urbis Constantin. continet Romam ad bas b. Petri ap. deferatur, et altera*

Rome received a further bequest of valuable vessels, and thus Charles, who had endowed the Church with so many privileges, such vast possessions, and so much gold and silver, was more liberal than any ruler of either earlier or later times. He was the true founder of the ecclesiastical State, and of the power of the Popes, of whose later illimitable expansion, however, he never even dreamed. For, although the devout son of the Church, which he recognised as the strongest bond of his Empire and the divine principle of human civilisation, he in nowise blindly surrendered himself to her service. He respected the immunity, which he himself had established, of the Metropolitan of Rome, but never forgot that he was ruler of the entire monarchy. His people regarded him as the chief director of all ecclesiastical affairs; he founded bishoprics and convents; he issued canonical regulations; he instituted schools for the people, and by embodying the constitutions of the Church in his code, gave these constitutions his supreme ratification. Both episcopate and synods stood at the same time under his determining influence.

The grateful Church later invested him with the nimbus of saintship.[1] Her struggles with the Hohen-

quae forma rotunda, Romanae urbis effigie decorata est, episcopio Ravennatis. . . . conferatur., A third silver table, which represented the world (*minuta figuratione*), consisted of three parts, probably corresponding to the three divisions of the earth. De Rossi (*Piante iconografiche—di Roma*, p. 73) believes that these graphic representations did not belong to this century, but perhaps to the time of the *Notitia utriusque imperii*.

[1] Paschalis III., anti-pope in the time of Alexander III., at Barbarossa's wish canonised Charles, and the beatification was ratified by

staufens reminded her of the fact that the great monarch had been the pious founder of the ecclesiastical State, and the Crusades revived the memory of the Christian hero in the minds of men. Like Octavian or Caesar, he had become mythical; and it was reserved for a Pope from the South of France, Calixtus II., in 1122, to pronounce genuine Turpin's celebrated history of the life of Charles and Roland, of which the Pope himself may possibly have been the author. The rapidity with which the figure of Charles was lost in myth is shown by a chronicler, who, writing his barbarous annals in the monastery of Soracte before the end of the tenth century, already related the story of the monarch's expedition to the Holy Sepulchre. And as it is scarcely likely that the monk himself invented the fable, but more probably received it as an already accepted tradition, we may venture to place its origin yet half a century earlier. Meanwhile, as the Charles of history had never become nationalised in Rome, neither did the Charles of legend. A stranger like Theodoric the Great, although a Roman Emperor, his figure was never associated with any place or building in the city, and he consequently faded from the memory of the Romans. It is worthy of remark that not a single word in the *Mirabilia* recalls the memory of Charles the Great.

Gregory IX. The Zürich city-library still possesses the decree of Bishop Eberhard of Constance, dated 22 February 1272, which commands the celebration of the festival of Charles.

3. Tumults in Rome—Bernard sent to investigate the Causes — Death of Leo III., 816 — His Buildings in Rome — Character of contemporary Architecture and Art—The titular Churches and the principal Convents.

Insurrection in Rome against Leo III., 814.

With the news of Charles's death the Pope saw an abyss open at his very feet. Scarcely were the Romans aware that the great ruler was dead, when they gave vent to their hatred against the civil power of the Bishop. Did we attempt to enumerate the successive revolutions which the ecclesiastical State endured from the time of its foundation in its more than thousand years' course, we should stand bewildered by the number. Half of these insurrections would have more than sufficed utterly to overwhelm the greatest earthly kingdom. Nevertheless, although rebellion against the temporal power of the bishop dated from the hour of its birth—a proof not only that an irreconcilable contradiction was involved in the union of priesthood with royalty, but also that the very existence of the ecclesiastical State maintained within itself a principle fully able to cope with revolutions—the State of the Church has survived until our own days.

The followers of Campulus and Paschalis (both men had been forgotten in their fourteen years' exile) had conspired against the Pope. Their aims were, however, discovered, and Leo had these offenders promptly executed as guilty of high treason. The holy bishop was thus henceforward obliged to steep

his hands in the blood of his own Romans. The news of the executions excited the indignation of even Charles's pious successor. The Emperor Lewis blamed the Pope for having acted with such haste and severity. And since it was the Emperor's duty to defend the Romans when there was any question of their privileges being violated, he considered, moreover, that his Imperial rights had been infringed by the Papal sentence being pronounced upon Roman nobles without any intervention on the part of his Legates.[1] He therefore sent the King of Italy to Rome to institute inquiries. Bernard fell ill on his arrival. Count Gerold, however, informed the Emperor of the result of his observations. The Pope now hastened to justify himself to the suzerain of Rome. His Legates strove to exonerate him from the charges which Bernard possibly, and the Romans undoubtedly, had brought before the Imperial throne. The indignation in the city was great, and in the same year (815) the enemies of Leo rose; while the Pope, agitated by these occurrences, lay seriously ill. The insurgents burnt the papal farmsteads, not only such as had been founded by Leo, but those also of earlier date.[2] The scenes of disturbance were generally

Another rebellion, 815.

[1] *Annal. Fuld. A.* 815: *Romae quidam primores in necem Leonis P. conspirantes interficiuntur.* Astron., *Vita Ludov.* c. 25: *perlatum est Imperatori, quod Romanor. aliqui potentes contra Leonem apostol. pravas inierint conjurationes, quos . . . supplitio addixerit capitali, lege Romanor. in id conspirante. Annal. Einh. A.* 815.

[2] Astronom c. 26 knows of Domuscultae of Leo III.: *praedia omnia, quae illic domocultas appellant, et novi ab eod. apostolica instituta erant.* According to *Annal. Einh.* these farms were situated *in singular. civitatum territoriis.*

outside the city; the Roman nobles armed the coloni or slaves on their estates, stirred up the towns in the neighbourhood, and threatened to march on Rome, in order to compel the Pope to surrender the property which he had confiscated from them or their friends beheaded by his orders, and appropriated to the benefit of the Apostolic exchequer. The growing power of the Roman nobility (a power destined in later times to become so formidable) is heralded in this revolt. Bernard sent Duke Winichis of Spoleto to Rome with troops to quell the rebellion. The Pope meanwhile died in great distress on June 11, 816.

Death of Leo III., June 11, 816.

Leo had occupied S. Peter's Chair for more than twenty years—a period fertile in great events, and during which, as priest of Humanity, he had inaugurated a new epoch in its history. Hated by the Romans because he had seized on the temporal power within the city, maltreated almost to death, reduced to flight, restored to power, kept in perpetual terror by repeated disturbances, he was not defeated by his adversaries. His was a powerful nature, capable of shrewd reasoning and bold views. The brief moment in which he crowned the new Emperor of the West in S. Peter's made him the instrument of the history of the world, and assured him an undying renown.[1]

Buildings in Rome in the time of Leo III.

In the number and extent of his buildings in the city Leo III. almost outrivalled Adrian. Ecclesi-

[1] The Church canonised him; it added his ashes to those of Leo I., II. and IV., which remain in an ancient Christian sarcophagus under the altar of Leo I., in the Chapel of the Madonna della Colonna. Above is Algardi's relief, and the names of the Popes are inscribed on the pavement.

astical Rome was restored in the Carolingian time—its second monumental period, if the age of Constantine be regarded as its first. And since the Popes of these times built so largely, they must necessarily be regarded as the chief destroyers of the ancient city. Architecture was in a state of constant activity. Abiding by the traditions of the Church, whose greatest buildings had been erected in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, it could no longer attain to the greatest of its models, but instead showed itself capable of nothing more than reproducing on a smaller scale the buildings of earlier days. Columns and ornaments of ancient buildings were appropriated; the New was entirely constructed from out the Old. Hence the era of the Carolingians left behind it many splendidly restored Churches, but no independent monument of any importance in Rome. With the ancient basilicas as models, architecture attained a certain height; but the countless number of churches and convents rendered the execution of great designs impossible. A certain littleness is therefore everywhere perceptible in buildings of the period. The brick decoration of friezes below the roofs, the composition of the usually small towers with arched windows (*camerae*) divided by columns, the ornamentation of the tower façades with round plates of various coloured marbles, the stunted porticoes with their tiny columns and mosaic friezes, adorned here and there with medallions also in mosaic, all give evidence of a lowered standard of design.[1]

[1] Such appears to me the character of all the churches belonging to

In employing Roman architects in the restoration of the basilica of S. Apollinaris at Ravenna, Leo may have been actuated either by a feeling of national pride or by a desire to give employment to his fellow-citizens. It by no means follows that Roman workmen had attained any special renown, such as the natives of Como had previously acquired.[1] Nevertheless, the continued activity in Rome must have fostered greater artistic talent than was to be found in any other city of Italy. The biographer of Leo III. conscientiously enumerates all the ecclesiastical buildings which Rome owes to the Pope. With his chief monument in the Lateran, the Triclinium, we are already acquainted. He also enlarged or embellished the papal palace, and built an oratory to the Archangel. He restored the celebrated baptistery of Damasus in S. Peter's, preserving, or imparting to it, its circular form.[2] He rebuilt the oratory of the Cross, a foundation of Symmachus, and adorned it with mosaics. He decorated the shrine with lavish splendour, placed gold and silver statues of the Apostles and Cherubim on silver pedestals, and inlaid the pavement with additional plates of gold. Further, and the fact deserves mention, he

the Carolingian period. S. Maria in Cosmedin, Francesca Romana, Nereo and Achilleo, the tower of S. Cecilia, S. Maria in Domnica.

[1] Agnellus, *Vita Martini*, c. 1: *Leo R. E. et Urbis Antistes misit cubicular. suum nom. Chrysaphum et reliquos caementarios, restauravit tecta B. Apollinaris.* The care of the Pope for the basilicas in the country districts is mentioned for the first time in the life of Leo III., a proof of the extended relations of Rome. Leo restored churches in Velletri, Praeneste, Albano, Portus, Ostia, Tibur, in the Sabina.

[2] *Lib. Pont. Vita Leonis III.* c. 65.

placed two silver shields engraved with the Apostolic Creed in Latin and Greek at each side of the tomb of the Apostle in S. Peter's, as well as in S. Paul's. No objection was yet raised to the Greek Confession of Faith. Leo also built episcopal dwellings beside S. Peter's, and there erected a beautiful triclinium, the floor of which was inlaid with variegated marbles.[1] He restored the tower of S. Peter, and erected a splendid circular bath-house for the use of pilgrims near the obelisk, which after a long interval of silence suddenly emerges as the Columna Major or great column.[2] Another ancient name also reappears. Leo founded a hospital at the spot called Naumachia. This hospital stood beside the Vatican, and was dedicated to S. Peregrinus, a Roman priest who had suffered martyrdom in Gaul in the second century. Owing to his name he was made the patron of pilgrims (*peregrini*), who flocked to Rome in vast numbers, especially from ancient Gaul. The present little church of S. Pellegrino, beside the Porta Angelica, serves to recall Leo's foundation on the same spot; and since the district was called Naumachia, it follows that here the Naumachia of Domitian must have formerly stood.[3]

[1] *Et in pavimento marmoreis exempla stratis* (c. 27). There were several buildings besides S. Peter's: *cum caeteris amplis aedificiis, tam in ascensu scalae, quamque post ipsum triclinium.* I think that this was in Charles's palace.

[2] *Fecit et ubi supra juxta columnam majorem balneum* (c. 89). The word *agulia* was not yet in use for the obelisk.

[3] *In loco, qui Naumachia dicitur* (c. 80, 81). The *Mirabilia* mention the *sepulcrum Romuli* in the Naumachia, consequently the entire space between the Vatican and S. Angelo must have borne the name. *Cod.*

Near S. Peter's, Leo restored the monastery of the proto-martyr Stephen, also the neighbouring convent of S. Martin.

One of the oldest titular churches, that of SS. Nereus and Achilleus (Fasciola) on the Via Appia, had been destroyed by inundations and was now rebuilt by Leo on higher ground. With a few alterations the church retains its ancient form, that of a small basilica with three naves. It is of harmonious proportions, but of its mosaics nothing beyond some fragments remain.[1] Judging from the catalogue of Leo's buildings, there was scarcely a single church that he did not restore, and the innumerable gifts of vessels and draperies testify to the wealth of the Lateran treasury. The love of splendour, conspicuous in the ancient Romans, seemed to be revived in the Popes. If we except some paintings on glass and miniatures in manuscripts, mosaic would appear to have been the form of art chiefly cultivated in Leo's time; and under the frequently recurring expression "Pictura" we may boldly assume that mosaic was more especially understood. The art of casting in bronze, silver and gold was diligently practised, and

Laurent. xxxv.: *In Naumachia est sepulcrum romuli et vocatur sci petri.* The *Anon. Magliab.* (xxviii. Cod. 53) thus speaks of the Leonine city: *civitas quae dicitur in Almachia.* The earliest mention of the Naumachia is that in the life of Leo; hence the spot must be fixed there. The name Dalmachia is first found in a bull of Leo IX. Tomassetti, "Della Campagna Rom." (*Arch. d. soc. Rom.* iv. 363).

[1] The church owes its preservation to its Cardinal Baronius. In an inscription there he admonishes posterity to refrain from modernising it. After the Rococo-period had destroyed the character of the Middle Ages, the churches experienced a new method of restoration, which we may call the drawing-room style.

innumerable statues were produced by this means. The arts of chasing in silver and working in niello were also cultivated. No statue of the period has come down to us. That figures in wood painted in colours and clad in draperies had, however, already been adopted in the churches can scarcely be doubted.

Out of the catalogue of Leo's foundations it is not unimportant to cite the names of those titular churches, diaconates and convents which Rome counted at this time, since in the centuries which follow we shall not find them given again with the like completeness. It appears that there were twenty-four churches which gave the title of presbyter: Aemiliana, Anastasia, Aquila and Prisca; Balbina; Calisto or S. Maria in Trastevere; Cecilia, Chrysogonus, Clemens, Cyriacus, Eusebius; Lorenzo in Lucina, Lorenzo in Damaso; Marcellus; Marcus; Nereus and Achilleus; Pammachius; Praxedis, Pudens; Quatuor Coronatorum; Sabina; Sylvester and Martinus; Sixtus, Susanna, Vitalis.[1] The Presbyter Churches in the time of Leo III.

Of diaconates the following are named:— Adrianus, Agatha, Archangelus[2]; Bonifacius on the Aventine; Cosma and Damianus; Eustachius; The Diaconates.

[1] The Synod of 499 mentions twenty-eight titulars; that of Gregory I. twenty-four, but S. Apostoli appears instead of the Aemiliana, and S. Anastasia is omitted. L. Duschesne, *Les titres presbytéraux et les diaconies* (*École Franç.* 1887, p. 220). According to the *Laurentian Codex*, Plut. 89, in the twelfth or thirteeth century there were twenty-eight titulars, which correspond with the *Lateran Codex* in Crescimbeni, *Ist. di S. Giov. av. P. Latina*, p. 369.

[2] Vignoli holds it to be S. Abbacyrus in Septimo. It can, however, only be S. Angelo in Pescaria, which existed in the time of Leo III.

Georgius; Lucia *in septem viis*, that is in *septizonio*, or *ad septem solia*; Lucia juxta Orphea; S. Maria Antiqua (the present S. Francesca Romana); further, the churches of S. Maria in Adrianio, in Cosmedin, in Cyro or Aquiro, in Domnica, in Via Lata, outside S. Peter's gate; Sergius and Bacchus; Sylvester and Martinus by S. Peter's; Theodorus; Vitus in Macello.[1]

The Convents.

More than forty convents are already named, and the number existing was still greater.

Five stood near S. Peter's—*i.e.* Stephanus Major or Proto-martyr, also Catagalla Patritia, Stephanus Minor; John and Paul; Martin, and the convent of Jerusalem.[2]

Near the Lateran are mentioned:—Pancratius, Andreas and Bartholomaeus, with the surname Honori; Stephanus, and the nunnery of Sergius and Bacchus.[3]

Near S. Maria Maggiore, Andreas, also called Catabarbara Patritia (perhaps identical with Andreas in Massa Juliana); Cosma and Damianus; Hadrianus,

[1] All these diaconates are found again in the Florentine Codex, except Sylvester and Martinus, S. Maria at S. Peter's gate and *in Adrianio*; it also mentions S. Nicolai *in carcere Tulliano*, a diaconate which is absent from Crescimbeni. He has accordingly the eighteen later diaconates.

[2] They are thus also specified as *monasteria quinque constituta juxta magnam Ecclesiam S. Petri. Bull of Joh. XIX. A.* 1024. *Bullar. Vatican*, i. 17.

[3] Andrew and Bartholomew is the present well-known hospital. The *Vita Pashalis I.*, n. 442, mentions Sergius and Bacchus: *post formam aquaeductus Patriarchii Lateran. positum.* I no longer find mentioned the ancient Benedictine monastery at the Lateran, which was again restored by Gregory III.

also S. Laurentii. These also bore the surname *ad Praesepe.*

Near S. Paul outside the gate, stood the convent Caesarius and Stephanus with the name *ad quatuor angulos*,[1] close to S. Lorenzo that of Stephen and Cassian.

Other Roman convents were:—

Agata super Suburram, Agnes outside the Porta Nomentana; Agapitus near the titular Eudoxia; Anastasius ad Aquas Salvias; Andreas on the Clivus Scauri; Andreas near the Santi Apostoli; Bibiana; Chrysogonus in Trastevere; a convent on the Caput Africae; the convent de Corsas or Caesarii on the Via Appia; the convent de Sardas, probably near S. Vito[2]; Donatus near S. Prisca on the Aventine; Erasmus on the Coelian; Eugenia outside the Latin gate; Euphemia and Archangelus near Sancta Pudentiana; the convent duo Furna, probably in Agone, on the Navona; Isidorus, perhaps on the Pincian; John on the Aventine; the convent de Lutara[3]; Laurentius Pallacini beside San Marco; Lucia Renati, in Renatis, or de Serenatis[4]; Maria

[1] This surname is found in a document *A.* 967, *Cod. Sublac.* of the Sessorian. Bibl. ccxvii. p. 142.

[2] These two convents prove the existence of a colony of Corsicans and Sardinians in Rome. *Vita Leon IV.* n. 507: *Mon. Corsarum juxta basil. b. Sixti Martyris*; Vignoli holds it to be S. Caesarius in Palatio. *Vita Leon III.* n. 406: *in Oratorio S. Viti quod ponitur in Monast. quod appellatur de Sardas. Vita Leon IV.* n. 499: *vicus qui nuncupatur Sardorum*: the same street is designated n. 541: *milliario ab urbe R. trigesimo.* It points to a colony of Sardinians in the Campagna.

[3] Martinelli and Vignoli misplace it on the Carinae; the latter holds it to be S. Maria Purificationis near S. Pietro ad Vincula.

[4] Mentioned in Muratori, *Antiq.* v. 772, and *Bullar. Casin.* ii. const.

Ambrosii, probably the same as that called Ambrosii de Maxima in the Forum Piscarium; Maria Juliae on the island in the Tiber; the nunnery of Maria in Campo Marzo, and the convent Maria in Capitolio, although not mentioned in the catalogue of Leo III.'s foundations, were undoubtedly already founded. S. Michael, unknown; the convent Tempuli[1]; Sylvester (de Capite); S. Saba or Cella Nova; Semitrii, unknown; Victor beside S. Pancratius on the Via Aurelia.

The twenty Abbeys of Rome which later rose conspicuous out of the great multitude of convents had not yet been established. The number of convents was continually on the increase, and at the end of the tenth century it was asserted that there were twenty nunneries, forty monasteries and sixty similar institutions for canons or such clergy as lived subject to cloistral rules.[2]

112 and 150. Armellini (*Le chiese di Roma*, p. 320) looks for it near the Trofei di Mario.

[1] Also in the *Ordo Rom.* xii. (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* ii. 206): *Monasterio Tempoli*; according to Torrigius (*Imagine di M. Vergine di S. Sisto e Dom.*) it stood in Trastevere; according to Mammachio (*Annal. Ord. Praed.* i. 557) near S. Balbina on the Via Appia.

[2] Arnoldus de S. Emmerammo lib. ii. c. 54 (*Mon. Germ.* vi.). With regard to the twenty later Abbeys of Rome see *Ordo* xi. in *Mabill.* ii. 160.

4. STEPHEN IV., POPE — HIS JOURNEY TO LEWIS — HIS SUDDEN DEATH — ELECTION AND ORDINATION OF PASCHALIS I.—THE PRIVILEGIUM OF LEWIS.

Stephen IV., Pope, 816–817.

After an interval of only ten days, an illustrious Roman, the Deacon Stephen, son of Marinus, was elected Pope without intervention on the part of the Emperor. Stephen, however, hastened to inform the suzerain of Rome of his loyalty. He caused the Romans to swear fidelity to the Emperor, and sent messengers to Lewis to justify both himself and the citizens for the haste of his election.[1] The first instance of a change of pontiff after the restoration of the Empire gives rise to several questions concerning the relations between the Pope and the Emperor. It even caused Stephen IV. himself to undertake a journey to France. The disturbances which had taken place in Rome, the discontent of the nobility, the necessity of settling the question by a new act of ratification, we may also add the desire of anointing the already crowned Lewis, and of having the coronation ceremony established as a papal right no longer to be evaded, were the motives which impelled the Pope to undertake the journey. Stephen's attitude towards Lewis was altogether different to the attitude of Leo III. towards Charles. If in the popular

[1] *Qui statim—jussit omnem pop. Rom. fidelitatem cum juramento promittere Hludowico.* Thegan., *Vita Lud.* c. 16. A proof of the Imperial sovereignty over Rome. *Praemisit tamen legationem, quae super ordinatione ejus imperatori satisfaceret.* Astron., *Vita*, c. 26. A proof that Charles already claimed the right of ratifying the Papal election; the right, however, had not yet become law.

imagination Leo, in setting the crown of the Romans on the head of Charles, had at the same time exalted himself above his benefactor, and acquitted himself of all his obligations, Lewis stood in an entirely independent position. The new Pope found himself face to face with a powerful hereditary Emperor, with whom he himself had no personal relations. This consideration weighed on Stephen's mind. He had, however, nothing to fear from the pious Lewis.

He crowns Lewis at Rheims.

Accompanied by Bernard, he entered Rheims in September 816, and was there received with the greatest respect. The fortunate priest anointed and crowned Lewis and his wife Irmengard in the cathedral, and, laden with gifts, and, above all, furnished with the ratification of the possessions, privileges and immunities of the Roman Church, he started on his homeward journey.[1] To the discontented Romans he brought as a solatium the pardon of the offenders sentenced to exile in France for the revolt against Leo III., and for whom he had interceded with the Emperor. These men, and among them Paschalis and Campulus, if indeed they still survived, now accompanied him back to Rome. The Pope died three months after his return, on January 24, 817.

[1] Astron. c. 26. Thegan. c. 16, 17. Stephen had brought a valuable crown with him; Ermold. Nigellus (II. v. 425) as a poet explains it to have been the crown of Constantine. He causes Stephen to acclaim the Emperor and his heirs: *quique regant Francos nec non Romamque potentem*; and informs us that the Chancellor Helisachar had drawn up in documentary form the Imperial ratification of the privileges of the Church. According to the *Annal. Einh.* the Pope started on his journey as early as the end of August.

The Romans forthwith unanimously elected Paschalis, the son of Bonosus, who was consecrated Pope on January 25. Paschalis I., a shrewd and energetic man, had previously been Abbot of the monastery of S. Stephen, beside S. Peter's; therefore, unlike his predecessors, who had all been either deacons or presbyters, he passed straight from the monastic cell to the papal throne. His unusually hasty ordination shows that the Roman clergy sought to oppose by rapidity of action the increasingly threatening claims of the Emperor to his right of ratification; and it makes it at least doubtful whether the decree attributed to Stephen IV., which ordained that no Pope could henceforward be consecrated without the Imperial consent, had yet been issued.[1] Like his predecessor, however, Paschalis judged it necessary to announce his hasty elevation to the Emperor, and to tranquillise Lewis with the assurance that it had followed upon canonical election.[2] His Legate Theodore brought back an Imperial diploma confirming the privileges of S. Peter. Paschalis I., 817–824.

Henceforward every change in the Imperial crown, every fresh papal election, brought with it the revival of the ancient privileges. Bishoprics and abbeys followed Rome's example; every occasion was seized to confirm ancient immunities by document, or to add other privileges to those already existing. The

[1] Flosz (*Die Papstwahl unter den Ottonen*, 1858) has assigned such a decree to Stephen IV.

[2] *Excusatoriam Imperatori misit epistolam. Annal. Einh.* 817. *Legatos cum epistola apologetica et maximis imperatori misit muneribus.* Astron., *Vita*, c. 27.

archives of the churches carefully treasured the series of Imperial diplomas which had gradually accumulated. Those of the Lateran already contained the great diplomas of Pipin, Charles and Lewis, deeds of gift, confirmations of old and new immunities, and other treaties between the Emperor and the Roman Church. Were they still extant and accessible, the value of these parchments to the historian would be absolutely priceless. To these documents was added in 817 the diploma of Lewis the Pious, doubtless a renewal of the earlier deed given by his Chancellor to Pope Stephen in the previous year.[1] In later times this document attained a great importance. Its contents were falsified, and having been exalted to the same level with the donation of Pipin, it was regarded as a donation of greatly enlarged extent, and from it new and vast possessions were derived as important rights for the papal chair.

The spurious Diploma of Lewis the Pious.

Only to mention the most striking points, in addition to the dominion over Rome and the Duchy, in addition to the ratification of the donations of Pipin and Charles, Lewis the Pious was represented as having given the Pope the patrimonies in Calabria and Naples, and even entire possession of the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily. Lastly, complete liberty in the election and ordination of the Pope, without any previous sanction of the Emperor, was accorded to the Romans. History, however, refutes these fictions, showing by its facts that the Emperors

[1] Astron.: *Theodorus nomenculator—negotio peracto, et petitis impetratis super confirmatione scilicet pacti et amicitiae more praedecessorum suorum, reversus est.*

still retained sovereignty over Rome. It also proves that at this period the Greeks retained possession of Calabria and Naples, of Sicily and Sardinia; and while the Byzantine government was at peace with the Western Emperor,—the limits of their respective territories being recognised as established by treaty,—we can scarcely suppose that the Emperor would have violated the existing harmony to endow S. Peter with great estates which were his neither by title nor possession.[1]

Lastly, the asserted liberty of papal ordination is refuted by a celebrated deed under Eugenius II.

Of the deed of Lewis there is not a single syllable in the *Liber Pontificalis*. The diplomas of Otto I. and Henry II., which the Church regards as among her most valuable deeds of gift and ratification, and which in the series of such deeds follow that of Lewis, although referring by name to the donations of Pipin and Charles, entirely ignore the deed of their successor.

[1] *Patrimon. Beneventan—et Salernitan., et patrimon. Calabrie inferioris, et super et patrim. Neopolitanum.* During the Iconoclastic dispute Byzantium seized the patrimonies in Southern Italy. The Franks had no possessions in this part of the country. There is no mention whatever of Benevento in Charles's will. *Insulas Corsicam, Sardiniam, et Siciliam sub integritate.* Ep. 4, Leonis III. mentions a donation of Corsica by Charles; it can, however, only have referred to some ecclesiastical property on the island. From this source and from a diploma of Lewis the Pious, the Popes derived their claims to Corsica. They had formerly possessed large estates in Sicily and Sardinia. These they reclaimed from the Greek Emperors. Nicholas I. wrote to Michael: *Calabritanum patrimon. et Siculum, quaeque nostrae eccl. concessa fuerunt — vestris concessionib. reddantur* (Labbé, ix. 1296). He was therefore unacquainted with the donation of Lewis, and only thought of ancient patrimonies. Even the diplomas of Otto I. and Henry I. are only acquainted with the *patrimon. Siciliae.*

It is not until the time of Gregory VII. and the bequest of the Countess Matilda that it is mentioned. It was then interpolated with additions in order to give a broad and ancient foundation to the papal claims.[1]

[1] The diploma "*Ego Ludovicus*" is mentioned for the first time in *Chron. Vulturnense*, end of saec. xi. (Murat. i. 2, 369), and *Leo Ostien.* i. c. 16, beginning of saec. xv. They nevertheless only say that Lewis had drawn up a *pactum constitutionis et confirmationis* for Paschalis. Gratian records the diploma in an abbreviated form in the *Decret. Dist.* 63, can. 30; Cencius introduces it in the *Liber Censuum*, probably from *Cod. Vatic.* 1984, saec. xi. or from Albinus (*Cod. Vatic.* 3057). Its spuriousness is maintained by Pagi, *ad A.* 817; Muratori, *Annal. Diss.* 34; *Piena espos.* c. 4; Beretta (*Tab. Chor.* vi.) attributes the fiction to the time of Gregory VII., to which date the falsifications of the *Pacta* (which merely survive in copies) of the years 817, 962, and 1020 probably also belong. Ficker (*Forschungen zur Reichs—und Kirchengsch. Italiens* (Innsbrück, 1869), ii. § 347 *f.*) believes that these celebrated diplomas contain forged passages, but are not themselves entire fabrications. According to him, the Privilegium of Lewis is already determined by the deeds of gift of Pipin and Charles of the years 754 and 774. He holds the passage relating to Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily to be forgeries, and of the same opinion are Sickel and Boretius, *Capitularia reg. Francor.* i. 2, n. 172; Sickel, *Acta Karolinor.* ii. 381; and *Das Privilegium Otto I.* (Innsbrück, 1883), p. 50 *f.*

CHAPTER II.

LOTHAR CO-EMPEROR—REBELLION AND FALL OF KING BERNARD—LOTHAR, KING OF ITALY—HIS CORONATION IN ROME—HE ESTABLISHES HIS IMPERIAL TRIBUNAL THERE—ACTION AGAINST FARFA—EXECUTION OF ROMAN NOBLES—PASCHALIS EVADES THE IMPERIAL SENTENCE—HIS DEATH.

Lothar co-Emperor.

LEWIS the Pious determined to follow the example of his father and to appoint his eldest, but still very youthful son, co-Emperor. This custom of the ancient Roman Empire had been already adopted by the new, in order that the unity of the State, and the hereditary succession, might thereby be secured. But scarcely had Lothar assumed the Imperial dignity in presence of the diet of the Empire assembled at Aachen, when the envy of the other princes was aroused. Filled with discontent, the brothers Pipin and Lewis returned to their royal seats in Aquitaine and Bavaria; while Bernard, the ambitious bastard, raised his arms in open revolt. Charles, following the example of Pipin, had installed Bernard simply as his lieutenant in the kingdom of Italy, but the natural desire for independence already asserted itself in the Kings of Italy. The longing of the Italians for national independence had been aroused, more especi-

ally in the northern provinces, where the Lombards, although long since Latinised, still warmly cherished their ancient tribal law and the traditions of their family and race, and where Milan had begun to outrival the earlier capital, Pavia. The fall of the Lombard kingdom had not crushed the receptive and industrious race who inhabited the country from the Alps far into Apulia. If we except Rome, where many Lombard families also dwelt, and where men of Lombard race had filled the papal chair, this Teutonic people retained the most important affairs of Italy in their hands. During the centuries of greatest darkness it was essentially the Lombards who gave heroes, princes, bishops, historians, poets, and lastly free republics to the country, and on Lombard energy consequently rests the greater part of the historic life of Italy. This fact, which is irrefutable, is eagerly disputed by many Italians of the present day, who, in defiance of history, speak of an Italian nation in centuries before any such nation had arisen, or forget that when it did arise it owed its origin to the fusion of the Gothic-Lombard and Latin races. In speaking of an Italian nation at this period, we have already narrowed the idea to its true historic proportions. The Lombard nobles no longer dreamt of a restoration of the decadent dynasty of Desiderius; but they longed to emancipate themselves from the hated rule of the Franks. The bishops, who, through the privileges accorded them by Charles and Lewis, had attained and had already grown accustomed to princely power, and who like territorial rulers possessed the chief voice in all political questions, urged Bernard

onwards. Among these prelates was Thiodulf, who, although bishop of Orleans, was a Lombard by birth; Wolfold of Cremona, and more important than any, Anselm of Milan. The thoughtless king soon found himself undeceived. The brothers Pipin and Lewis remained motionless, and as the Imperial army approached the frontiers of Italy, Bernard saw himself deserted by his troops. The perplexed youth hastened to Cavillon, and either trusting to some promise already received, or prompted by despair, there threw himself at the feet of his uncle. The former suggestion seems to afford the more probable solution of his conduct, since in the absence of any promise of the kind it is scarcely likely that he would have been accompanied by his confederates. The Emperor, however, threw both Bernard and his companions into prison. Bernard was condemned to death in Aachen, and although he obtained a remission of his sentence, the Emperor had the unfortunate prince deprived of his sight. This Byzantine punishment was, according to report, by command of the vindictive Irmengard, so barbarously carried out that Bernard died three days after its infliction (Easter 818).[1] The like fate was suffered by his friend Reginhar, son of Count Meginhar, formerly Imperial Count Palatine, while the imprisoned bishops were deprived of their benefices, and banished to monasteries by sentence of the Frankish clergy. The Emperor in his weakness had yielded to pressure from his wife and had surrendered to her advisers. When informed

Bernard revolts against the Emperor.

His tragic fall, 818.

[1] Concerning these events see: B. Simson, *Jahrbücher des fränk. Reichs unter Ludwig d. Frommen*, Leipzig, 1874, vol. i.

of the death of his nephew, he bitterly bewailed him, and acknowledged his error in having sanctioned the cruel sentence. Four years later he performed a public penance for this and other offences—an action which weakened the Imperial prestige and increased the moral power of the bishops. They comforted the Emperor, reminding him of the example of the repentant Theodosius, and themselves of the criminal jurisdiction of Bishop Ambrose.[1] We are not informed whether Paschalis interceded with Lewis for a mitigation of Bernard's sentence. But since the character of the time suggests the probability of papal interference, we may take for granted that in a case so far removed from the ordinary course of events the Pope must have brought his paternal counsel to bear upon the Emperor. The throne remained vacant for the space of two years after Bernard's death—a circumstance not entirely displeasing to the Roman Church, to which the Italian kingdom had already become irksome.

Lothar, King of Italy,

The conditions of Rome at this period are shrouded in darkness so intense that it is only at intervals, and when interwoven with the history of the Empire, that we obtain a glimpse of the affairs of the city. Lothar, the eldest son of Lewis, already proclaimed Emperor, was also declared King of Italy, and the two dignities were now united in one person for the first time since Charles the Great. Although Lothar had already (in 820) received the crown of Italy from his father,

[1] Thegan. c. 23. *Chron. Reginen.* tells the truth: *Bernhardus dolo capitur.* Astron., *Vita*, c. 30; Thegan. c. 22; *Annal. Einh. A.* 817, 818. Andreas Presbyter: *Hermengarda—oculos Bernardo evulsit.*

it was not until two years later that he was sent to Pavia. He had been married to Irmengard, daughter of the powerful Count Hugo; and on the occasion of his son's wedding the Emperor had pardoned the imprisoned bishops. In August 822 Lewis held an Imperial Diet at Attigny, and there commanded Lothar forthwith to proceed to his kingdom. He gave him as counsellors the Monk Wala, who had already been minister to Bernard, and Gerung, an official of the Court. Nevertheless, he did not intend to accord the King of Italy a permanent residence at Pavia, but rather sent him there to set the affairs of the country in order and to administer justice. No sooner, however, had the prince executed his commission than he was commanded to return to France; whence it is evident that the suspicious father was not anxious that his son should remain in Italy. Paschalis, who heard of Lothar's intended departure (it was just before Easter 823), sent him, from quite intelligible motives, an urgent invitation to come to Rome to receive coronation and unction at the papal hands.

is crowned in Rome by the Pope, 823.

Lothar, with the knowledge of his father, accepted the invitation. He was received with Imperial honours, was crowned by the Pope in S. Peter's on Easter day, was proclaimed Augustus by the Romans, and, since the coronation of his father had taken place at Rheims, was the first Emperor since Charles who received the crown in Rome.[1] The Roman Curia

[1] Astron., *Vita*, c. 36: *diadema imperiale cum nomine suscepit Augusti. Annal. Fuld.: Hlotharius juvenis, rogante Paschale papa Romam veniens, ab eodem coronatur, et a populo Romano imp. Augustus appellatur.* There are therefore two Imperial epochs in Lothar's diplomas—that of 820, and that of 823.

thus upheld the principle that Rome was the source of the Imperium, and the further principle that to an Emperor, although already elected and crowned by decree of the Imperial Diet, papal unction was indispensable. Paschalis, after having consecrated the young Emperor, now admitted that Lothar, like his predecessors, possessed Imperial power over the Roman people[1]; and Lothar forthwith proceeded to exercise this power, pronouncing sentence during his short sojourn in the city.

Lothar erects his Tribunal in Rome.

An action which the Pope brought against the Abbot of Farfa and lost, merits our attention. The rich Benedictine monastery had previously stood under the protection of the Lombard kings, and had later enjoyed the like privileges under the Carolingians. It could point to a charter of Charles the Great of the year 803 which ratified its immunities. In 815 it had obtained a similar document from the Emperor Lewis, in which it was pronounced as standing under his "Privilegium, Mundiburdium and Imperial protection, in order that the monks might pray in peace for him and the continuance of his Empire."[2] No bishop could levy tribute or rates on Farfa. The monks enjoyed complete exemption. They chose the abbot from their midst, and over the abbot the Pope himself possessed no further right than that of consecration. Besides the diplomas of kings and emperors which lay in their coffers, the monks possessed bulls

Exemption of the Abbot of Farfa.

[1] Fragment. *Langob. Hist.* (Murat. i. 2, 184): *Paschalis—potestatem, quam prisci Imperatores habuerant, ei super populum Romanum concessit.*

[2] *Chron. Farf.* (Murat. ii. 2, 364).

of ratification from Popes. Only a few days before his death Stephen IV. had recognised all the privileges and possessions of Farfa, and had merely imposed an annual tribute of ten golden solidi on the convent. Farfa, however, seems to have freed itself from this obligation also, since in the Bull of Paschalis I. of the same year we find no mention of the tribute.[1] Meanwhile, from time to time the Popes strove to reduce the vexatious privileges of the Abbey. Adrian and Leo III. had already annexed several of the monastic estates, and during Lothar's visit to Rome the papal proctor had asserted in presence of the Imperial tribunal that "Farfa was subject to the law and rule of the Roman Church." The Abbot Ingoald, however, bringing with him the valuable diplomas of his archives, showed the written guarantees of exemption, and the decision of the Imperial tribunal obliged the papal chamber to restore all the lands unlawfully wrested from the Abbey.[2]

Lothar's energetic conduct had excited the hostility

[1] The Bull of Stephen IV., x. Kal. Febr., in the *Chron. Farf.* and in Galletti, *Del Prim.*, App. n. I. ; the Bull of Paschalis in the *Chron. Farf.* p. 372.

[2] Diploma of Lothar from Cavillon, *A.* 840, *Chron. Farf.* p. 387. The dispute was renewed in 829, and was lost by the Pope. *Placitum* in the Vatican, *Regest. Farf.* n. 285. Lewis's Missi, Bishop Joseph and Count Leo, were *a finibus Spoletanis, seu Romania* ; we may note how ancient is the name *Romagna*. The province of the Emilia and Ravenna was the territory not conquered by the Lombards, where Roman law was in force. In a diploma of the year 881 are distinguished : *possessiones tam in Langobardia, quam in Romania, sive in Tuscia, et in Ducatu Spoletano. Monumentor. Magni Farf. Chartarii Epitome* of Fatteschi, *Cod. Sessor.* ccxviii. n. 331.

of the Roman clergy, while the enemies of the temporal power of the Papacy eagerly attached themselves to the young prince. The division of the city into a papal and an Imperial party, a division which lasted for centuries, began with the new Empire, and was revealed by an event which took place soon after Lothar's departure. The young Emperor had returned to Lombardy. He had already met his father in June, when a tumult, undoubtedly provoked by the same causes as those which had given rise to the rebellion against Leo III., took place in Rome. Messengers arrived at the Imperial residence with the information that two of the ministers of the papal palace, the Primicerius Theodore and his son-in-law, the Nomenculator Leo, had been first blinded and then beheaded in the Lateran, and that Pope Paschalis himself had commanded or counselled the deed.[1] These men (Theodore was still nuncio in France in 821) belonged to the highest nobility, were of pronounced Imperialist views, and occupying the influential position, which had already been found favourable to rebellious designs, had probably striven for the overthrow of the papal government. They were seized and executed in the Lateran by the Pope's servants.[2] The Emperor Lewis listened to the com-

Paschalis suppresses a revolt in Rome without legal process.

[1] —— *quod se in omnib. fideliter erga partes Hlotharii juvenis imp. agerent; erant et qui dicerent, vel jussu vel consilio Paschalis pont. rem fuisse perpetratam. Annal. Einh. A.* 823.—Astron. c. 37. That the Romans were themselves the accusers, is asserted by Thegan. c. 30: *imputantes ei, quod nonnullorum homicida fuisset.* We see the nature of the position in which the Popes stood towards the Romans even at this time.

[2] The expression of the *Annal. Einh.: interfectores praedictorum hominum, quia de familia S. Petri erant*, does not point to a judicial act.

plaints of the Romans, and ordered his Missi to institute inquiries. But before they had set forth messengers from the Pope arrived to exonerate Paschalis, and to explain that the Pope himself would court an inquiry.[1] The Imperial judges departed in July or August 823, but were startled on their arrival in Rome by the information that Paschalis declined to submit to their judgment. Whether or not he feared the result, he avoided submitting himself to the sentence of the judges, and had recourse to an already tried means of escape. He took, that is to say, the oath of purgation in presence of the Imperial Legates and the Roman people in the Patriarchium of the Lateran. At the same time he defended the murderers, anathematised the murdered as men guilty of high treason, and pronounced their death an act of justice. The envoys, accompanied by the papal Legates, returned to France, there to impart the unexpected tidings. The Emperor was indignant, he felt his duty as a protector and a just judge towards his Roman subjects; his own rights also demanded the most searching inquiry into the murder; but since the Pope's action had prevented an inquiry, he was obliged to let the matter rest. Concerning his reply to the Romans and the Pope, history does not inform us.[2]

The Imperial trial against the Pope is avoided.

Paschalis meanwhile died in circumstances resem- Death of Paschalis

[1] *Accusationi opponentes excusationem, et super vita imperatori offerentes examinationem.* Astron. c. 37. *Annal. Einh.* I., 824.

[2] *Imp. natura misericordissimus, occisorum vindictam ultra persequi non valens quanquam multum volens, ab inquisitione hujuscemodi cessandum existimavit, et cum responsis congruis missos Romanos absolvit.* Astron.

bling those which had accompanied the death of Leo III. He too foundered on the antagonism that existed between the temporal and spiritual powers of the bishops. Agitated by recent events, hated by a great part of the Romans, he was snatched away by death early in 824. The Romans refused to allow his remains burial in S. Peter's, and his successor found himself obliged to lay them in another church, a basilica built by Paschalis himself, apparently the basilica of S. Prassede.[1]

2. Paschalis builds the Churches of S. Cecilia in Trastevere, S. Prassede on the Esquiline, S. Maria in Domnica on the Coelian.

Rome still retains some interesting monuments of Paschalis I. His likeness (rare in Popes of so early a date) has also been preserved in three mosaics, each of which shows the same tonsured head and long face. The art of the age could, however, do no more than depict a portrait in outline. These portraits are found in the three churches restored by Paschalis: Cecilia in Trastevere, Prassede on the Esquiline, and Maria in Domnica on the Coelian.

Paschalis builds S. Cecilia

To Cecilia, the muse of music in the heaven of the Roman saints, legend of later date has ascribed the invention of the organ. Raffaelle in one of his loveliest paintings has represented the saint with the attributes

[1] Thegan. c. 30. According to the *Annal. Einh.* Paschalis died in 824, a few days after the return of his envoys. Pagi assumes the date February 10.

of the muse,[1] a figure than which scarcely any more gracious has been depicted by Christian art. A national saint like Agnes, Cecilia was the favourite of all the noble matrons in Rome, who believed that in her they honoured the illustrious descendant of the Metella family. Two maiden figures, those of Cecilia and Agnes, hovered as ideals of virtue through the darkness of Rome's most barbarous period. Legend related that Cecilia had married the youthful Valerian, and that the night after their marriage she informed her husband that an angel protected her maiden purity. The dismayed bridegroom desired to see her inconvenient guardian, beheld him, and afterwards, influenced by the spiritual nature of his bride, received baptism at the hands of Bishop Urban. Cecilia suffered martyrdom, and died November 22, 232, with three sword wounds in her neck.[2] With her last breath she entreated the Bishop to transform her house in the Trastevere into a church. Urban caused her to be wrapped in gold-embroidered robes, placed in a coffin of cypress-wood, which was enclosed within a stone sarcophagus, and laid in the catacombs of S. Calixtus on the Via Appia.[3] Her church, one of the

[1] The first organ was brought to the Franks from the Greeks about the year 757. Einhard records that in the year 826, George, a Venetian Presbyter, who had learnt the art of organ-building, was employed in Aachen by the Emperor Lewis. Muratori, Diss. xxiv.

[2] She is thus represented in Maderno's pleasing statue in her own church.

[3] Spot and sarcophagus are shown in these catacombs, on which De Rossi's researches have thrown so much light. The lead pipes of an ancient bath are still seen in one of the chapels in the church dedicated to the saint.

oldest in Rome, conferred a title on a cardinal as early as the fifth century. Paschalis found it in ruins and rebuilt it. He wished to remove the body of the saint, but since the coffin could not be found in the catacombs, he came to the conclusion that it had been carried away by the Lombards under Astolf. A vision, however, came to the aid of the Pope. As one Sunday morning he lay slumbering before the shrine of S. Peter, an angelic maiden stood before him. She informed him that she was Cecilia, assured him that the Lombards had not discovered her ashes, and encouraging the Pope to continue his search, she disappeared. Paschalis found the remains of Cecilia in the Cemetery of Praetextatus, reposing in her golden draperies by the side of Valerian, who had followed her in death.[1]

The restoration of the church was no slight achievement for the art of the age. The large basilica had a gallery with a double row of columns like that of S. Agnes. Later restoration has altered the ancient plan, but not essentially destroyed it. A large atrium, at this time enclosed by a pillared colonnade, stood in front of the church, into which led the still existing vestibule. The roof was supported by four ancient Ionic columns and by two pillars with Corinthian capitals at each end. The frieze has a rough mosaic decoration: medallions over each column and pillar represent the saint whose remains Paschalis laid beneath the shrine. The walls of the vestibule, painted perhaps in the thirteenth century, illustrated the history of Cecilia. A fragment which still exists,

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, *Vita Paschal.* n. 437.

built into the wall in the interior of the church, depicts the burial of the saint by Urban, and the vision of Paschalis where the girlish figure stands before the sleeping Pope — a remarkable picture, the awkward drawing and tone of colour of which bespeak a respectable antiquity. It is impossible that it can belong to the time of Paschalis, but it may not improbably date from that of Honorius III. The subject is pleasing and tender as a lyric poem.

The interior of the church (now much altered) consisted of three naves. The two rows of twelve columns in the central nave supported the gallery, four at the entrance to the choir; and a crypt contained the tomb of the saint. The mosaics of the tribune still remain. Christ, clad in draperies of golden yellow, and holding a roll in His left hand, stands between S. Peter and S. Paul—utterly barbarous figures. To the right of the spectator, and close to S. Peter, Cecilia and Valerian present their crowns of martyrdom; on the left, beside S. Paul, stands a saint, perhaps Agatha, also Paschalis—a tall figure with large eyes, a blue square nimbus behind his head and the model of the basilica in his hands.[1] Palms enclose the mosaic, and a flame-coloured phoenix is seen over one branch. Lower down Christ and the disciples are depicted in the customary form of lambs, and still lower are some lines celebrating the work of Paschalis.[2] The style of

[1] Paschalis had also built a convent beside the church *in hon. martyr. Agathae et Caeciliae juxta ipsius eccl. in loco qui dicitur colles jacentes. Lib. Pont.* n. 438.

[2] *Haec domus ampla micat variis fabricata metallis,*
Olim quae fuerat confracta sub tempore prisco.
Conditit in melius Paschalis praesul opimus

these mosaics (those on the arch have perished) is Byzantine, and Christ is even represented as bestowing the blessing in the Greek manner, with three fingers closed on the thumb. The execution is rough, the long, haggard figures being merely sketched. No distribution of light or shade has been attempted, and the folds of the draperies are simply indicated by coarse thick strokes. The supposition that the work is that of Byzantine artists receives support from the fact that Paschalis showed himself favourable to Greeks, of whom there were many in Rome.

S. Prassede.

His second monument, S. Prassede, the church of which he had himself been cardinal, stands on the Esquiline. After an existence of several centuries the ancient basilica had fallen into a tottering condition, when the Pope caused it to be thrown down and a new one built. The later church, although not so completely transformed as S. Cecilia, has also suffered many changes in the course of time. The plan of the two churches is very similar. A flight of twenty-five steps leads from the Subura to the outer court, now no longer used, a lateral door serving as an entrance to the church. Slender ancient granite columns sur-

Hanc aulam Domini firmans fundamine claro.
Aurea gemmatis resonant haec Dyndima templis,
Laetus amore Dei hic conjunxit corpora sancta
Caeciliae, et Sociis, rutilat hic flore juventus :
Quae prius in cryptis pausabant membra beata.
Roma resultat ovans semper ornata per aevum.

Dyndima, instruments of music in general. Concerning the mosaics, see Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* c. 27 ; Laderchi, *Acta S. Caeciliae et Transtyb. Basilica*, Roma, 1722 ; Bondini, *Memorie storiche di S. Cecilia*, Roma, 1855.

mounted by Corinthian capitals divide the interior into three naves; there is, however, no gallery. The raised Presbyterium ends with the tribune, which, like the triumphal arch, still remains adorned with mosaics. A subject introducing various figures covers the upper part of the wall; saints with their crowns, Christ with the globe and surrounded by angels stands over Jerusalem; men strive to enter the city guarded by angels. On the two lateral walls crowds of believers are represented, as on the triumphal arch in S. Paul's. The Saviour in golden draperies and holding a written roll occupies the tribune, and we observe that the figure of Christ has been modelled on that of the mosaic in Cosma and Damiano. To the left of the Saviour stands S. Paul. With one arm he clasps S. Prassede, who carries her crown in her hands; Paschalis (the square blue nimbus behind his head and offering Prassede the church) stands beside her. To the right, S. Peter, S. Pudenziana, and S. Zeno with a book, form a similar group. The palms and phoenix are again represented. Below is the river Jordan, and still further down Christ and His disciples are depicted as lambs, together with the two golden cities, and lastly the usual inscription in couplets.[1] The arch of the tribune in its inner circle displays, like that of S. Cecilia, the monogram of Paschalis. And here, as

[1] *Emicat aula pie variis decorata metallis*
Praxedis Domino super aethra placentis honore,
Pontificis summi studio Paschalis, alumni
Sedis apostolicae, passim qui corpora condens,
Plurima Sanctorum subter haec maenia ponit,
Fretus ut his limen mereatur adire polorum.

there, we see above it the lamb enthroned, the Seven Candlesticks, the two angels, the apocalyptic symbols of the Evangelists and the Elders offering their crowns. The artist in following the model of SS. Cosma and and Damiano produced a fairly successful work, and endowed the angels more especially with a certain grace of motion.

In the same church Paschalis built and dedicated a little chapel to Zeno, a Roman martyr of the time of Diocletian. This chapel, which constitutes a remarkable monument of the art of this period, still remains in perfect preservation. It is entirely covered with mosaic, and was once deemed so beautiful as to be called "the Garden of Paradise." The mosaics, however, are more barbarous than those of the tribune, where some good traditional features, more particularly in the feminine figures, are at least retained.

Nevertheless, the large picture in S. Prassede forms the best monument of a period when mosaic art, already entirely imbued by influences so-called Byzantine, emitted a last flickering ray before its extinction. It is possible that it also may have been the work of Greek artists, since close beside the church Paschalis had built a monastery for brethren of the order of S. Basil. The contemporary revival of the Iconoclastic persecution in the East, where Leo the Armenian had revived the principles of his Isaurian predecessor, obliged numbers of Greek monks and artists to seek refuge in Rome ; and these men here renewed relations with Byzantine art.

The ancient diaconate of S. Maria in Domnica (in Greek, Kyriaka), now called "della Navicella," from

a modern copy of an ancient votive boat set up there, stood on the Coelian.[1] Paschalis gave the church its present form, that of a basilica with three naves. Two rows of nine antique granite columns form the principal nave. The mosaics of the tribune have unfortunately been ruined by restoration. The Virgin enthroned with the child, angels standing beside her, and Paschalis on his knees clasping her right foot with both hands, are here depicted. Flowers of various kinds spring from the ground. S. Maria in Domnica.

We pass over the numerous oratories and chapels in other churches erected by this Pope. One fact alone arrests our attention. The biographer of Paschalis relates that a fire reduced to ashes the Saxon quarter, designated thus early by the German word "burgus," and destroyed the entire portico of S. Peter; that the Pope hastened thither, by his prayers quenched the flames, and that he rebuilt the quarter, and restored the portico.[2]

[1] The custom of placing antiquities in front of churches was popular. The bronze pine-cone stood in the courtyard of S. Peter's; the porphyry urn—now the coffin of Clement XII. in the Lateran—before the Pantheon; a large ancient marble vase still remains in the courtyard of S. Cecilia; a similar one in the court of S. Apostoli. It is possible that the votive boat in front of S. M. in Domnica may have come from the Camp of the Foreigners, which had formerly stood only a short distance from the church. The V. Cohors Vigilum stood near the Villa Mattei. De Rossi, *Le Stazioni delle VII. Coorti dei Vigili*, Roma, 1859, p. 27 *f.*

[2] *Lib. Pont.* n. 432: *gentis Anglorum—omnis—habitatio, quae in eorum lingua burgus dicitur.* This fire possibly took place in the time of Leo IV.

3. EUGENIUS II., POPE—LOTHAR COMES TO ROME—HIS CONSTITUTION OF THE YEAR 824—DEATH OF EUGENIUS, AUGUST 827.

Eugenius II., Pope, 821-827.

Eugenius, Presbyter of S. Sabina, son of the Roman Boemund, whose name betrays a northern descent, was the successor of Paschalis. Eugenius announced his elevation to the Emperor Lewis, and the Emperor sent Lothar to Rome in order to adjust all political and civil relations with the new Pope and the Roman people by an Imperial statute.[1] Repeated disturbances in Rome, the open disunion which prevailed between the Pope and the city, and the well-founded complaints of the despotism of the papal judges, rendered the step necessary.

Lothar comes to Rome.

Lothar was received with great magnificence by Eugenius in September 824. The young Caesar who had come to restore law bewailed the attitude which the Papacy had assumed towards the Emperor and Rome, lamented that faithful adherents of the Emperor had been executed, and others subjected to persecution. He censured the avarice of the papal judges, the incapacity of clerical government, and the ignorance or forbearance with which the Popes themselves regarded these abuses. The loud complaints of the Romans demanded a strict inquiry into the deeds of violence perpetrated under Eugenius's predecessors and the already corrupt ecclesiastical

[1] *Ut vice sua functus, ea quae rerum necessitas flagitare videbatur, cum novo pontifice populoque Romano statueret atque firmaret. Annal. Einh.* 824.

State, which, being in the main nothing more than a great ecclesiastical immunity under Imperial protection, demanded a firmer settlement. Paschalis had succeeded in evading the Imperial tribunal. He was now dead, and Lothar, unopposed, established it in Rome. The negligence of the past was retrieved; the Imperial power proceeded energetically with its work, and acquired the sincere gratitude of the people. The papal exchequer was compelled to surrender all property confiscated from the Romans; the unjust judges were punished with exile, and Lothar, without more ado, banished them to France.[1]

Imperial trial and condemnation of the Papal Camera.

Imperial authority enjoyed a momentary degree of splendour such as it rarely again attained. The people were devoted to the German Caesar who defended his rights, and the promulgation of a statute added to the general content. This celebrated constitution of Nov. 824 regulated in nine articles every question concerning the administration of law and the system of relations between the city, the Pope and the Emperor. The joint authority of the temporal government of Emperor and Pope, both in Rome and the ecclesiastical State, was recognised as a principle, the Pope as territorial ruler possessing the initiative of immediate power, while supremacy, ultimate appeal, and the supervision of all temporal affairs belonged to the Emperor. Legates were to be appointed in

The Civic Constitution of Lothar, Nov. 824.

[1] Astron. c. 38: *reddendo quae injuste sublata erant, Hlotharius magnam populi R. creavit laetitiam. Annal. Einh.* 824: *statum populi R. jamdudum quorundam praesulum perversitate depravatum—correxit.* In presence of such facts it is ridiculous to deny the Emperor's supremacy over Rome.

the joint name of Emperor and Pope. These envoys were annually obliged to report to the Emperor as to how the papal duces and judges administered justice to the people, and whether they obeyed the Imperial constitution.[1] All complaints were to be brought before the Pope in the first instance, in order that he might either repair the evil through his own Legate, or suggest the despatch of special Imperial Missi. That the decree might be all the more rigorous, Lothar commanded all papal judges to appear in person before him, in order that he might inform himself of their name and number, and might impress upon the mind of each the share of work confided to his care.[2]

Distinction between the various laws of persons in Rome.

With this settlement of legal affairs in general was closely connected the special determination of the personal choice of law, since Lothar summoned nobles and people to decide by which system they wished personally to be judged henceforward. Each independent inhabitant of city or duchy was obliged to acknowledge one code of law. Were accounts of the registers which were taken—in Rome according to the regions, in the duchy according to the various districts—forthcoming, they would serve as important

[1] *Constitutio Lotharii I.* (*Mon. Germ.* iii. 249): *Volumus etiam, ut Missi constituantur a D. Apostolico et a nobis, qui annuatim nobis renunciant.* . . . These were *missi ex latere imperatoris* (Astron. c. 38), and were employed even earlier: there were generally two, a layman and a priest, a count and an abbot, a dux and a bishop, for both spiritual and secular affairs. *Constitutio de Missis ablegandis, Hludovici et Hlotharii Capitul. A.* 828 (*Mon. Germ.* iii. 328).

[2] *Volumus etiam et numerum et nomina scire, et singulis de ministerio sibi credito admonitionem facere.* N. viii. of the Statute.

statistical tables concerning the number of inhabitants and relations of race, and would undoubtedly prove how thoroughly Rome itself had become saturated with German elements. The Imperial ordinance abolished the principle of Roman territorial law, for the very reason that the Lombard and Salic personal law had long been in use in Rome and the surrounding territory. It proved the increasing resistance of the German inhabitants, who, during the period when the city was subject to Frankish supremacy, refused to submit to Roman law, which the papal judges naturally tried to enforce. Not only was the German judicial system generally adopted in Rome, but the German system of magistracy also began to work gradual changes in the Roman procedure.[1]

The distinction of codes of personal law is characteristic of the Middle Ages, the social constitution of which rested on the differences of individual franchises, and in the shelter of which the individual equally with the guild could fortify himself against arbitrary oppression. The distinction shows further to what degree this separation must have nourished the defiant spirit of individuality which we admire in the

[1] The paragraph begins: *Volumus etiam, ut omn. Senat. et pop. Roman. interrogetur, quali vult lege vivere, ut sub ea vivat.* The clergy for the most part adhered to the Roman law (*Capitul. Hludov. I. ut omnis ordo ecclesiar. secund. Romanam leg. vivant, Mon. Germ.* iii. 228). The earliest application of this constitution is seen in an instrument of Farfa, *A.* 829, in Galletti, p. 184: *uterque secund. suam legem. A.* 869: *Ego Gregorius fil. Leonis de Civitate Roma, Legem vivens Romamam* (*Chron. Casaur.* in Murat. Diss. xxii.); thus also is the *salva lege mea* in the form of oath of the Romans to be understood. The earliest example of a judgment being given in Rome according to Lombard law is in May 813 (in Galletti, *Del. Vestar.* p. 31).

character of the Middle Ages. It shows clearly at the same time the rude and insecure conditions of contemporary society. The continual collision of individual rights must have caused endless confusion and difficulty in the system of justice. In Rome the law of Justinian, which the Lombards had abolished in all the cities they had conquered, still remained in force. It endured as the permanent link between antiquity and modern times, as the germ of the civic life of the Romans, and as the deepest source of Roman nationality. This liberty to choose a law, as presupposing the possibility of any Roman acknowledging a Frankish or Lombard code, must necessarily have offended the Romans. The edict of Lothar, however, never in the slightest degree called in question the immense superiority of Roman law, or doubted the national feeling of the Romans, which, although not so prominent as it showed itself a century later, nevertheless always existed. And although throughout the rest of Italy the Germans—who had however adopted the Roman language and culture—still remained numerous both in cities and provinces, and filled the highest offices in Church and State, Rome alone could claim to represent the purest Latin nationality. The idea of Roman citizenship still survived even outside Italy in the Empire, and was still synonymous with liberty.[1] True that the blood of the

[1] Two edicts of the Emperor Lewis—one to Bernwein, Archbishop Crispolitanae Eccl., from Nimwegen, in May 821; the second to Archbishop Adelram of Salzburg, from Frankfort on June 19, 823—concede to these bishops the privilege of granting freedom and Roman citizenship before their masters to such slaves as had been elected presbyters in their dioceses, *ex jugo servitutis exsolvant, cives Romanos*

Romans had long mingled with that of Goths, Lombards, Franks and Byzantines, and that it would have been hard to find genuine descendants of ancient families, nevertheless the Roman race preserved an essentially Latin stamp. The names of the populace remained predominantly Roman or Greek, while throughout the rest of Italy German names ending in *-old*, *-bald*, *-pert*, *-rich*, *-mund*, *-brand*, &c., fill all historical documents. Roman national feeling received from the date of this constitution a new impulse, the decisive distinction of law giving unity, power and importance to its citizen class. Thus did the Pope and the Romans conceive this profession of law, while the Emperor himself wished to strengthen and secure the German element in Rome. The schools of foreigners in the city maintained henceforth the law of their race. The Imperial monastery of Farfa successfully did the same, and even individual Germans ventured to appear before the Roman tribunal to assert their personal rights. The intermixture of nationalities meanwhile made proselytes in law. Women adopted the law of their husbands, widows were allowed to return to that of their parents.[1] Individual Franks or Lombards, owing to relations of clientship, pronounced in favour of the code of Justinian. They were then solemnly proclaimed

eos proclament eisque libellos manumissionis et perfectae ingenuitatis more solito conscriptos tradant. Sickel, *Reg. der ersten Karolinger*, n. 166, 197.

[1] As late as 939 Theoderanda, daughter of the Consul Gratianus, adopted Frankish law as wife of Ingebald, Rector of the Sabina, *quae modo professa est vivere in lege Salicha.* Fatteschi, *Serie*, &c., n. lxi.

Roman citizens. A formula of the tenth, perhaps even of the ninth century, defined the manner in which the candidate was to be enrolled in the list of Roman citizens.[1]

The right of the individual was thus publicly acknowledged by Lothar's edict; the Salic and Lombard law obtained recognition in their respective spheres, but the Roman was and remained the almost universal law, until it was confirmed as the law of the country by a later edict of Conrad II.

Recognition of the territorial supremacy of the Pope.

The statute acknowledged the temporal dominion of the Pope. The Romans were expressly ordered to yield him obedience. To avoid all disturbance at the papal election, it was ordained that no free man nor slave should venture to hinder the election, and that only those Romans on whom age had conferred the right of voting should take part in the election of a pontiff. Exile was imposed as the penalty for the transgression of this article.

The election of a Pope, an act of such importance for the city, was thus superficially regulated, but it is to be observed that the constitution does not define the part assigned to the Emperor. The Emperor claimed the right of ratification: Odoacer, the Gothic Kings, the Byzantines, had exercised this right, the Carolingians could not renounce it. It has been frequently doubted whether the settlement of this question between Emperor and Pope originated in a treaty of Lothar. In spite of the fact that only one writer speaks of such a treaty, all circumstances of the

[1] *Qualiter Romanus fieri debeat.* See further below.

time seem in favour of its probability. According to this author the Roman clergy and people took the following oath :—

"I promise by the Almighty God, by the four Gospels, by the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the body of the holy Peter, Prince of the Apostles, that from this day henceforward I will be true to our Lords and Emperors Lewis and Lothar, according to my powers and intelligence, without falsehood or cunning, without prejudice to the faith I have promised to the Apostolic Pope: that I will not suffer the papal election to take place in this Roman seat otherwise than as prescribed by the canon and law according to my power and knowledge: and that the elected shall not with my sanction be consecrated Pope until he has taken such an oath in the presence of the Imperial Missus and of the people, as the Lord and Pope Eugenius did in writing of his own accord for the general good."[1]

The settlement of all public and personal relations was undoubtedly accompanied by a corresponding adjustment of the administration of the city. And here we regret the absence of all documents relating to a matter so important as that of the original relations of the Pope to the city after the foundation of his temporal dominion. As to whether the Romans

[1] This oath under the Statute of Lothar is found in the new edition of the *Capitularia regum Francorum* (1883) of Boretius (*Mon. Germ. Leg.* sec. ii.). Cenni rejects the fact, which rests solely on the authority of this doubtful Fragment, *Langob. Hist.* (Murat. ii. p. 1, *A.* 825), where it is said, moreover, that Lothar came to Rome for the second time in 825. Pagi accepts the statement; Muratori is inclined in its favour, and supports it by the ratification of the election of Gregory IV.

obtained by charter the government of the city by magistrates, how the magistrates were appointed, whether the prefect were restored, consuls appointed, we are completely in the dark. We cannot, however, doubt that changes of some kind took place, that, in order to reconcile the citizens to the Papacy, the constitution of Lothar conceded greater rights to the ever increasing requirements of the people. The fact at least that for a considerable time after the constitution was granted no insurrection is heard of in Rome, seems to speak in favour of such a supposition.[1]

Such were the eventful transactions of Lothar during his second visit to the city. His constitution henceforward remained the foundation for the temporal position of the Pope and his relations with the Emperor, who thus obtained the supreme jurisdiction in the ecclesiastical state.[2] After the Romans and the Pope had sworn allegiance to the constitution, Lothar could leave the city with his mind at rest, and return to receive the praises of his gratified father.

Eugenius II. died in August 827, after a brief but prosperous reign. The peace which the West in general, and the city more especially, had enjoyed was in great part due to the moderation of the

[1] Giacinto Gigli (caporione di Campitello about 1644) writes (*Mscr. Sessorian.* 334): *per autorità di Lothario Imp. il Popolo Romano tornò alla creatione de' Magistrati che furono Consoli, Prefetto et* 12, *Decarchoni nell' anno di Christo* 825. There is probably some truth in this supposition.

[2] Ficker, *Untersuch.* ii. 366.

Pope; still more, however, to the Carolingian edict, which for the first time had given the Roman people a certain autonomy with regard to the Papacy.[1]

4. VALENTINUS I., POPE — GREGORY IV., POPE — THE SARACENS INVADE THE MEDITERRANEAN AND FOUND THEIR KINGDOM IN SICILY—GREGORY IV. BUILDS NEW OSTIA—FALL OF CHARLES'S MONARCHY—DEATH OF LEWIS THE PIOUS — LOTHAR SOLE EMPEROR — PARTITION OF VERDUN, 843.

Valentine I., Pope, 827.

The successor of Eugenius, Valentinus I., son of Peter, a Roman of the Via Lata, died forty days after his accession. Another Roman, the son of John, a man of noble birth, who had previously been Cardinal of S. Mark's, was hereupon elected. The new Pope, who called himself Gregory IV., did not, however, receive consecration until after he had obtained the Imperial ratification.[2]

Gregory IV., Pope, 827–844.

The times were filled with threats of approaching storm. In the North Charles's recently founded monarchy was shaken by the dissensions of his already degenerate house; in the South Saracens and Moors from Africa, Candia and Spain advanced with increasing power in the Mediterranean, eager to gain possession of Italy, as their fellow-believers had

[1] *Lib. Pont., Vita Eugen.: Maxima autem pax—nam ipse—pacis amicus.* The *Vita* of Eugenius occupies only a line or two.

[2] *Sed non prius ordinatus est, quam legatus imp. Romam venit, et electionem populi, qualis esset, examinavit. Annal. Einh. A.* 827. This is the passage which supports the probability of Lothar's decree.

already gained possession of Spain. Saracen pirates had long cruised in the Tyrrhene Sea, and had plundered the islands and the shores of the mainland; and already in the time of Leo III. towers had been erected and guards stationed along the Roman coast for defence against the pirates. In 813 they attacked Centumcellae (Civita Vecchia), sacked Lampedusa and Ischia, landed in Corsica and Sardinia, and swarmed in Sicilian waters.[1]

In 813 the Patricius resident in Sicily had bought a ten years' peace; a military revolution, however, broke out in the beginning of 827, and decided the fate of the beautiful island. The Byzantine General Euphemius rose in insurrection. The troops of the Armenian Palata who remained faithful to the Greek Emperor drove Euphemius to Africa. Here the traitor made overtures to Ziâdet Allah, ruler of Kairewan, proposing with his aid to conquer the wealthy island on condition of obtaining recognition as Emperor. Arabs, Berbers, fugitive Spanish Mohammedans, the flower of Africa, sailed to the coasts of Sicily, and landed near Mazara on June 17, 827. Palata was defeated, the victors advanced before Syracuse; but, unable to take this strong

[1] Leo III. Ep. 4 to Charles: *littoraria nostra et vestra ab infestatione paganorum—tuta reddantur atque defensa.* The *Annal. Einh. A* 813, alone speaks of the devastation of Centumcellae. In 812 Leo III. (Ep. 8) writes: *ingressi sunt in insulam quandam, quae dicitur Iscla majore, non longe a Neapolit. urbe miliaria XXX.* Thus was the ancient Aenaria already called in the vulgar tongue. The defence of Corsica was transferred to Count Boniface of Lucca. Leo III. already makes use of the name Moors, Agareni (sons of Hagar), and the questionable term Saracens. See d'Herbelot on this word.

city, stormed first of all Palermo on September 11, 837.[1]

With Sicily fell the bulwark which had defended the mainland from the Saracens. The Southern provinces henceforward formed the stage of deadly strife between the Emperors of East and West and the African Sultans. The news of the fall of Sicily, where the enemies of Christendom established the seat of an Arab monarchy in the neighbouring Palermo, must have caused the Pope to tremble for the safety of Rome itself. Seawards the city lay open to the enemy, for the crumbling walls of Portus and Ostia could offer no resistance to the invader who wished to enter by the Tiber. A Roman garrison may still have been quartered within the walls of either fortress, but the number of inhabitants of both one and the other was daily reduced by flight. Ostia was now more active and populous than Portus, the vessels which still made their way to Rome following the left arm of the Tiber, which remained navigable. Amid the ruins of ancient temples, baths and theatres the church of S. Aurea had been erected, and here dwelt the Bishop, the most important of all the suburbicarian prelates, to whom belonged the privilege of consecrating the Pope.[2] Gregory resolved to fortify Ostia. The utter ruin of the ancient city convinced him, however, of the expediency of found-

[1] *Storia dei Musulmanni di Sicilia*, by Michele Amari.

[2] *Ep. Hostiensis, qui debet consecrare et benedire Apostolicum prae omnibus aliis*, says John Diaconus (Mabillon, *Mus. It.* ii. 566); he then enumerates in order the Bishops of S. Rufina, Portus, Albano, Tusculum, Sabina, Praeneste.

ing a new one.[1] He built the second city from the materials of its predecessor, the monuments of which were now entirely destroyed. He surrounded his foundation with strong walls, whose towers he provided with catapults.[2] His work finished, the Pope called the town after himself, Gregoriopolis; but happily it did not long retain its unwieldy name. The year of the foundation of New Ostia is unknown; it must, however, have followed close on the conquest of Palermo by the Mussulman.

While the advance of the Saracens struck Christendom with dismay, the wanton quarrels between Charles's successors made doubtful its defence by the Empire. The new Roman Empire seemed on the point of disruption; the crown of its great founder was dishonoured on the head of his own son and by the insolent hands of his grandsons. The rude times of the Merovingians were revived on Charles's death: lust of power, avarice and licentiousness, characteristics of the ancient Frankish dynasty, reappeared to corrupt the new. The sons rose against their father, and the whole Empire was aflame with the unnatural rebellion. The appearance of the great Charles may be compared to a flash of lightning, which, piercing the night, illuminates the earth for a moment, only to leave darkness behind.

Decay of Lewis's Monarchy.

Lewis the Pious married for a second time in 819.

[1] *Vita Gregor. IV.* n. 476: *fecit—in praedicta civitate Ostiensi civitatem aliam a solo.* Nevertheless, not in, but close to it. Thus ancient Capua was deserted about 841, and a little later new Capua arose.

[2] The expressions are: *portis simul, ac seris, et catharactis—et desuper—petrarias nobili arte composuit, et a foris—altiori fossato praecinxit, ne facilius muros contingere isti valerent.*

His wife was Judith, daughter of Welf, Duke of Bavaria, the first prince of a name so ominous in Italian history. In 823 Judith, to the chagrin of the other princes, Lothar, Pipin of Aquitaine and Lewis of Bavaria, had borne a son—Charles. The original division of the Empire was now changed, and the young prince received a share. Between the weak and priest-ridden father and the refractory sons stood an insolent minister, Bernard, Duke of Septimania, the tutor of the boy prince, and, as it was whispered, the lover of the Empress. The elder sons revolted against their father. In 830 Lothar rose in arms in Italy; Pipin attacked the Emperor in France, and the two princes in concert demanded that their prisoner should resign the crown and retire to a monastery. The people, however, restored him to the throne, and the brothers quarrelled. In 833 they were again unanimous, and war broke out afresh on every side. The sons set up their camp opposite their father in Alsatia, whither Lothar summoned or conducted the Pope to effect a peace. To the Franks, however, Gregory IV. only appeared as a disturber of the peace, and a partisan of the rebellious sons. The old Emperor, suspicious of his purpose, received him without any show of reverence; the bishops of his party (still bitterly hostile to the supremacy of the Roman chair) even declared that if the Pope came to excommunicate, he would go forth excommunicated. Gregory consequently accomplished nothing in the camp of the princes, and finally returned "without honour" to Rome.[1]

[1] The *Vita Walae*, ii. c. 16, relates that the Pope was in terror

The Head of the Church had witnessed how, after Lewis's desertion by his corrupt adherents, the father had been made prisoner by his sons; how the bishops had supported the frivolous political grievances of the princes; and he afterwards learnt that a council at Compiègne had excommunicated the dethroned Emperor. He himself had only sought to effect an equivocal mediation, the result of which had diminished his authority. Called to the highest mission of the priesthood—to soothe irritated humanity by love, and to establish peace between princes and peoples—he had shown himself intent solely on his own advantage.

After the brothers had divided the Empire and had quarrelled afresh, after, with the aid of Lewis of Germany, the Emperor had reascended the throne, Lothar came to Italy. The Pope, who dared not openly acquiesce in his course of conduct, was obliged to reprimand the undutiful son; Lothar now seized on the ecclesiastical property; and his officials even put some of the Pope's followers to death. The Emperor wished himself to come to Rome to ease himself of his burthen of guilt and misery at the Apostle's grave, but, unable to carry out his project,

because the bishops of France wished to depose him. Gregory wrote to him that he was mindful of the oath tendered to the Emperor, but that he must reprove him for all that he had done to destroy the unity and peace of the church. (Mansi XIV. 521.) Nithard (*Hist.* i. c. 4) says that the rebellious sons had won the Pope over to their side: *magnis precibus in supplementum suae voluntatis assumunt.* He was entirely in Lothar's power, R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, i. 343; Simson, *Jahrb. des fränk. Reichs unter Ludwig dem Frommen*, vol. ii.

he sent envoys to his son and to the Pope. Gregory also sent his nuncios to France; Lothar, however, expelled them, and it was only in secret that the papal letters were conveyed across the Alps. Such are the events of the year 836. The history of Rome is veiled in silence so complete that the annalist eagerly seizes on these occurrences in order to fill the void of time.

Death of Lewis the Pious, 840.

The unhappy Lewis died on July 20, 840; and Lothar, to whom he had bequeathed the crown, sceptre and sword of Empire, now ascended the throne as sole emperor. Strife, however, broke forth with fresh fury, and a fierce civil war began, which Gregory strove in vain to appease. After Lothar had unsheathed the sword to defend the unity of the monarchy against his brothers, after he had been vanquished on the deadly field of Auxerre (June 25, 841), the combatants at last came to terms in the memorable partition of Verdun of the year 843, by which the monarchy of Charles was dismembered and reduced to its national racial divisions, and Germany, Italy and France severed from one another. The Emperor Lothar received the entire kingdom of Italy with the "Roman city," and consequently designated his son, Lewis II., King of Italy,[1] Such was the form which the Empire of Charles—a theocracy erected on the principles of Christendom—

Partition of the Empire at Verdun, 843.

[1] *Omnia regna Italiae cum ipsa Romana urbe, quae et modo ab omni sancta ecclesia propter praesentiam apostolor. Petri et Pauli speciali quodam veneratur privilegio, et quond. propter Romani nominis invictam potentiam orbis terrar. domina dicta fuerat*; thus Regino, Abbot of Prüm, *Chron. A.* 842.

assumed in the course of a generation after the coronation of the great Emperor.

5. Mania for Relics—The Bodies of Saints—Their removal — Character of the Pilgrimages of the Ninth Century — Gregory IV. rebuilds the Basilica of S. Mark—Restores the Aqua Sabbatina—Builds the papal Villa Draco—His death in 844.

The historian of Rome at this period is obliged to fall back on the annals of the Frankish chroniclers, which, however, supply but scanty information, and on the biographies of the Popes, which contain little beyond lists of buildings and votive gifts. He therefore despairs of giving any account of civic life in Rome; but, since religious interests chiefly occupied the minds of the citizens, we may bestow a glance upon religious matters.

Passionate desire to obtain relics.

Rome still continued to scatter relics over the West, as in the days of Astolf and Desiderius. A new passion, the singular desire for the possession of the bodies of saints had mastered the Christian world; and, fostered by the avarice and lust of power of the priests, it increased in the growing ignorance of the age to complete frenzy. We look back appalled to the time when a skeleton stood on the altar of Humanity to receive its laments, its desires, its shuddering raptures. The Romans, who with practical insight always understood how to make capital out of the needs of foreign nations, now drove a

regular trade in corpses, relics and images of the saints, and to this traffic and to the sale of ancient manuscripts the commerce of the city was entirely restricted.[1] The countless pilgrims who thronged to the sacred capital could not leave her without bearing away some consecrated memorial. They bought relics from the Catacombs, as visitors of the present day buy jewels, pictures and statues. Only bishops or princes, however, were able to gain possession of entire corpses. The guardians of the churchyards kept watch through anxious nights, as if against hyaenas, while thieves prowled around and employed a thousand frauds to attain their objects. These thieves themselves were frequently the victims of fraud, for the amused priests did not hesitate to procure false corpses and furnish them with suitable labels.

In 827 the Franks stole the remains of SS. Marcellinus and Peter, and carried them to Soissons. In 849 a presbyter of Rheims took a body, which he asserted was that of the mother of Constantine.[2] The

[1] Still later, German satire, jeering at Rome, said:

Truncasti vivos crudeli vulnere sanctos:
Vendere nunc horum mortua membra soles.

Epigram on Rome in *Cod. Udalrici XXI.*

[2] In the ninth or tenth century Napoleon would have imposed a tribute of corpses upon Rome. Chroniclers record the arrival of SS. Marcellinus and Peter in Aachen (*Annal. Xant.* and Astron. c. 41). Siegbert asserts that the body of S. Helena lay in the church dedicated to these martyrs. Baronius, however, *ad A.* 849, says that there was an old dispute between the Latins and Greeks concerning the possession of her remains. They were also claimed by the Venetians. The French claimed to possess the remains of Gregory I., as well as those of Benedict.

possession of remains of such exalted sanctity was esteemed so valuable, as entirely to condone the disgrace of the theft. It was also provided that these remains should work miracles while on their travels, and thus announce their acquiescence in their enforced translation and increase their own value. The custom of the ancient Romans, who brought the likenesses of gods from foreign cities to place them in their temples, seemed thus to be revived. The Popes frequently gave their consent to the removal of Roman saints to other lands; and the storm of entreaties from cities, churches and princes for the possession of such favours was incessant. The dead were borne out of the city on ornamental cars, accompanied by a solemn procession of priests and laymen, who, bearing torches and chanting hymns, followed the coffin some distance on its way. The people streamed forth to meet the funeral car all along its route. They implored miracles, chiefly in the form of healing. Arrived at its goal, in some town of Germany, France or England, the dead was honoured with a series of festivals which lasted several days. Dismal triumphal processions such as these frequently left Rome for the provinces of the West, and while they advanced from one city or country to another, they diffused a sort of morbid faith and a spirit of superstitious enthusiasm, of which we can now scarcely form an idea.[1]

[1] See for example *Translatio S. Alexandri* (*Mon. Germ.* ii.), and Einhardi, *Hist. Translat. SS. Marcell. et Petri*, Act SS. Juni 2, p. 201. In 836 the body of Bishop Severus was stolen from Ravenna and brought to Mainz by Archbishop Otger.

The translation of two celebrated Apostles precisely at this period excited a universal sensation and increased the desire for similar possessions. In 828 Venetian merchants, amid many adventures, brought the body of S. Mark from Alexandria to Venice, the patron of which city the saint now became.[1] In 840 there arrived at Benevento another apostle, Bartholomew, who had long previously swum in his marble coffin from India to the island of Lipari. The Saracens had plundered the island later in the year, and taken the bones of the saint from the grave. A hermit collected and carried them to Benevento, where Sicard, the reigning prince, laid them in the cathedral amid unspeakable rejoicings.[2] The Southern Italians, already sunk in the grossest superstitions, made use of dead saints for political demonstrations. In 871 the Capuans, bearing the body of S. Germanus on their shoulders, had entered the camp of Lewis II., hoping by means of their sacred burthen to propitiate the king. The anxiety for saintly relics was scarcely anywhere more fervent than at the court of the last Lombard ruler of Italy. As in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Popes or Princes were enthusiastic in collecting antiquities and manuscripts, so Sicard,

[1] Saints became patrons of cities. Rome placed S. Peter and S. Paul upon her columns, Venice the Lion of S. Mark, Genoa S. George. The dead Mark worked his greatest miracle in the building of the Cathedral of Venice, which was begun in 976.

[2] *Leo Ostiens* i. c. 24. I saw at Monte Casino two manuscripts, n. 139 and 149, of the end of the eleventh century, which relate the translation of S. Bartholomew to Lipari and Benevento; they are silent, however, regarding his removal to the island in the Tiber in the time of Otto II. or III.

sending his agents to all islands and along all coasts, collected bones and skulls, entire bodies and relics, and deposited them in the cathedral of Benevento, thus entirely transforming the temple into a museum of sacred fossils. We may imagine the alacrity with which he was served. As other monarchs extorted tribute from the conquered, he made use of his wars to extort corpses. He forced the people of Amalfi to surrender the body of Trifomena, as his father Sico had previously obliged the Neapolitans to surrender the body of S. Januarius, which had also been brought to Benevento amid the enthusiastic rejoicings of the inhabitants.[1]

The Pilgrimages.

With this worship of the dead was associated the great pilgrimage movement, which at this time and in succeeding centuries stirred the West. Movement is a natural law of mankind; wars and business, commerce and travel, have always kept the life of society in motion; but in early mediaeval times the peaceful movement of mankind consisted chiefly in pilgrimages, which reached their height in the Crusades, the greatest pilgrimage in the history of the world. All races, all ages and classes took part in these pilgrimages; the emperor, prince and bishop as well as the beggar, the child, the youth, the noble matron. The old man wandered barefoot bearing the pilgrim's staff. The impulse fostered in mankind a romantic spirit, the longing for the adventurous and unknown. Rome had called these processions into existence in the West, and had drawn them within her walls. And although they did not end in Rome,

[1] *Anon. Salern.* c. 49.

more especially after many other sanctuaries had been provided for the requirement of more urgent needs in other provinces of the Empire, nevertheless the delusion that a pilgrimage to the Eternal City placed the believer in secure possession of the keys of Paradise lasted for nearly two hundred years. Bishops exhorting mankind to these pilgrimages encouraged the idea. The child-like faith of an age, which had not discovered that the way to atonement lies within the human breast, but believed that it was to be found in journeying to some distant material symbol of salvation, sufficed to satisfy the pious traveller, who faced the inclemency of the elements, the dangers of hostile roads, and passed through the premeditated renunciations of a long and toilsome pilgrimage, as through Purgatory, before he reached the goal of grace. Every merited or unmerited trouble, every form of human suffering, every crime could turn with hope to Rome, to receive absolution at the holy places or at the feet of the Pope. The incalculable importance which the belief of mankind attributed to one single city has never been repeated, and never can be repeated again. That in times of utter barbarism such a sanctuary of peace and expiation existed was in truth fortunate for mankind. Innumerable companies of pilgrims journeyed to Rome; whole tribes crossed the Alps or arrived by sea, all drawn by a moral impulse. But sorrow, modesty and virtue were too often condemned to make the journey in company with shameless vice and cunning fraud, and, while on the very way to salvation, through contact with evil, to become themselves corrupt. The demoralising

intercourse with men who were severed from all family ties, the adventures and allurements offered by the journey, the seductive arts practised in the dissolute cities of the South, wrought the ruin of countless women, and many who had left their native country as modest maidens, widows or nuns to strengthen their vows at the grave of S. Peter, returned home fallen, or remained behind in Italy to lead an abandoned life.[1]

The Penitents.

Pilgrims streamed daily through the gates of Rome. If some bore the aspect of genuine piety, the beggar-like and fierce demeanour of others must have struck terror into the beholder. Many were branded with the most heinous crimes. If the laws of modern society oblige the criminal to be withdrawn from the public gaze, removed from all association with the upright, and leave him in solitude to his punishment or his reformation, a contrary course was pursued in the Middle Ages. The criminal was sent forth provided with a certificate from his bishop, which openly acknowledged him guilty of murder or incest, prescribed his journey, its mode and its duration, and at the same time furnished him with a certificate of identity which granted him protection. He traded on his crime, attested by the episcopal signature, as on a passport, showing it to all abbots and bishops in the places through which he passed. To this letter of in-

[1] As early as 744 Archbishop Boniface of Milan wrote to Cuthbert of Canterbury that the Synod should forbid women and nuns *iter et frequentiam, quam ad Roman. civitat. . . . faciunt, quia magna ex parte pereunt, paucis remanentibus integris. Perpaucae enim sunt civitates in Langobardia . . . Francia . . . Gallia, in qua non sit . . . meretrix generis Anglorum.* The Synod of Friuli in 791 (Canon XII.) forbade nuns from going on pilgrimages to Rome. Muratori, Diss. 58.

troduction and of condemnation the criminal owed his hospitable reception. He could travel free of care from station to station until he reached the sanctuary which was his destined goal.[1] The penal code of the Middle Ages shows a strange combination of brutal barbarity and angelic mildness. The glorious principles of Christianity, of showing mercy to the fallen, or opening the way of reconciliation for the sinner, came into collision with the institutions of civil society. The same age which through a decree of a sacred synod condemned offenders guilty of high treason to lose their sight, or to ride through the city on a mangy ass, provided the murderer of father or mother with a pilgrim's passport, and shielded him from the vengeance of the Furies which had followed Orestes. Rome, the great *refugium peccatorum*, gave shelter to all sins that ever had form or name. The histories of the pilgrimages were at the same time the criminal histories of the period. Terrible figures frequently cross the scene—men who, like the penitents of India, carried chains, others half-naked, with iron rings round their necks, or with a band of iron welded round the arm. These were the murderers of parents, brothers or their own children, upon whom a bishop

[1] *Tractoria pro itinere peragendo* in the *Book of Formulae*, Marculfi Monachi, Paris, 1613, lib. v. 214: *de hoc vid. facto quod instigante adversario—proprium filium suum, sive nepotem—interfecerit.* Since the murderer was obliged to spend so many years in pilgrimages, he was not to be denied *mansionem et focum, panem et aquam.* A pilgrimage as punishment for the crime of manslaughter had taken the place of the ancient German Weregild. Envoys on their travels were provided for somewhat better. See the *tractoria legatorum*, p. 33, n. xi., and the long bill of fare for their entertainment.

had imposed a pilgrimage to Rome. They threw themselves down on the graves with shrieks, scourged themselves, prayed, fell into ecstasies. Sometimes their skill succeeded in bursting their fetters at the tomb of some martyr. And since the expiation of a crime offered an immediate passport to hospitality, it happened not unfrequently that rogues disguised themselves under the mask of criminals, simply in order to obtain opportunity of adventure and gain. They travelled through the country with false passports, excited the thoughtless compassion of mankind, obtained food in abbeys or in pilgrims' quarters. Many feigned to be possessed, ran with strange gesticulations through the towns, and, throwing themselves down beside the images of the saints in the convents, in their presence suddenly regained sense and speech, received presents, by no means insignificant, from the gratified monks, and proceeded on their way to ply their arts elsewhere.[1]

The worship of relics has no more powerful accuser than the immorality and falsehood which were its consequences in the Middle Ages.

Gregory IV. rebuilds the Basilica of S. Mark.

To Gregory IV. is ascribed the institution of the festival of All Saints, a festival especially allied with the Pantheon, and celebrated throughout the entire West on November 1. The translation of the body of S. Mark to Venice may have prompted the Pope to restore the basilica below the Capitol which

[1] Charles had already issued an edict against frauds of this kind: *Capitulare*, n. 45, Aachen, *A.* 802: *ut mangones et cociones et nudi homines qui cum ferro vadunt, non sinantur vagari et deceptiones hominibus agere. Mon. Germ.*, 100, Muratori, Diss. xxiii.

bore the name of the saint, all the more probably since Gregory himself had been Cardinal of the basilica. This ancient church had, however, originally been dedicated, not to the Evangelist, but to Pope Marcus. The form which it received when restored by Gregory has been changed, although the original mosaics in the tribune remain unaltered. Christ is represented in the act of blessing; on the left beside him stand Pope Marcus, S. Agapitus and S. Agnes; on the right S. Felicissimus, the Evangelist Mark and Gregory IV., who offers the church to the saint. The style, with a few deviations, is that of the mosaics of Paschalis. The palms are absent, the figures have bases with the names inscribed (an absurd conceit); and the phoenix is placed below the basis of the figure of Christ.[1]

He restores the Aqua Trajana.

Gregory conferred a notable service on the city in the restoration of the Trajana or the Sabbatine aqueduct, which after its previous restoration by Adrian I. had a second time fallen into ruin.[2] He also turned his attention to the cultivation of the Campagna. The insurrection in Leo III.'s reign had caused the ruin of several estates, among them that of Galeria, Adrian's foundation on the Via Portuensis.

[1] These couplets were placed in the Tribune:

Vasta tholi firmo sistunt fundamine fulcra,
Quae Salamoniaco fulgent sub sidere ritu.
Haec tibi proque tuo perfecit praesul honore
Gregorius Marce eximio cui nomine Quartus.
Tu quoque posce Deum vivendi tempora longa
Donet, et ad coeli post funus sydera ducat.

[2] *Formam, quae Sabbatina nuncupatur quae jam per plurimos annos confracta—noviter aedificare—nisus fuit. Lib. Pont., Vita,* n. 467.

Gregory restored the Colony. The founder of New Ostia was obliged to provide the territory on the Tiber with inhabitants; he therefore established the colony of Draco. Here he also built himself a beautiful country house, adorned with porticoes—the first instance on record of a papal villa.[1]

Gregory IV. died, according to the statements of ecclesiastical writers, on January 25, 844.

[1] *Ibid.* *In curte, quae cognominatur Draconis, domum satis dignam*, &c. *In qua tam ipse, quamque etiam futuri Pontifices cum omnibus, qui eis obsequuntur, quamdiu eis placuerit ibidem statiose immorari valeant.* The Domuscultae are here called *curtes*. Nibby (*Annal. de dintorni di Roma*, i. 553) shows the *fundus Draconis*, and the present tenute of Dragone and Dragoncello in this neighbourhood.

CHAPTER III.

1. Sergius II., Pope—King Lewis comes to Rome—His Coronation—His Differences with the Pope and the Romans—Siconolf in Rome—The Saracens attack and plunder S. Peter's and S. Paul's—Death of Sergius, 847.

Rome was soon stirred to excitement by a divided election. Clergy and nobles (the Princes of the Quirites, as the *Liber Pontificalis* with Roman decorum begins to express itself) elected Sergius, Cardinal of SS. Martin and Sylvester; while John, an ambitious deacon, was forcibly conducted to the Lateran by a body of armed retainers. The nobles quelled the disturbance, and Sergius II. was ordained. Belonging himself to an illustrious Roman family, he was favoured by the nobility.[1] His consecration, however, took place without the Emperor's ratification, apparently because the tumult in the city caused it to be solemnised in haste. Lothar, indignant at the violation of his Imperial rights, commanded the King of Italy to advance with an army to Rome. Lewis

Sergius II., Pope, 844–847.

[1] Martinus Polonus invents a story to the effect that he was called *Os Porci*, and that he was therefore the first Pope who changed his name. John XII., however, is the earliest instance of a Pope changing his name.

set forth accompanied by Drogo, Bishop of Metz, by a son of Charles the Great, and by several prelates and counts. Outrages committed on his march through the ecclesiastical State announced his indignation from afar. An imposing escort, sent by Sergius, met him a short distance from the city. At the ninth milestone he was received by the judices, a mile outside the gates by all the scholae of the militia and the clergy. It was the Sunday after Whitsuntide. The Pope awaited him on the steps of S. Peter's, saluted and embraced him, and walking at the pontiff's right hand he advanced through the atrium to the silver door of the basilica. But it and all other doors were shut. The wary pontiff, turning to the dismayed king, thus addressed him: "If thou comest with upright and benevolent intentions, and for the welfare of the republic, the entire city and this church, then shall these doors be opened unto thee; if otherwise, neither I nor any at my command shall open them."[1] The King protested that he had come with good intentions; the doors were opened, and the solemn chant, "Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini" greeted the entrance of King and Pope. Together they knelt in prayer at the grave of the Apostle. Here princes were led on their arrival, and here their wrath was frequently averted like a harmless flash of lightning by the bronze sarcophagus of S. Peter.

King Lewis comes to Rome.

The Frankish troops encamped outside the walls,

[1] *Lib. Pont.* in Sergio II. n. 484. The *Annal. Bertin., ad. A.* 844, assign expressly as the cause of Lewis's arrival: *ne deinceps accedente apostolico quisquam illic praeter sui (imperatoris) jussionem missorumque suorum praesentiam ordinetur antistes.*

apparently on the Neronian Field, and demanded access to the city. Sergius, however, kept the gates closed.[1] The Romans hastened to rid themselves of Lewis and his army. The election of Sergius was first tried before a synod; the Frankish party disputed its validity. They were, however, appeased, and acknowledged Sergius, who on the following Sunday (June 15) anointed and crowned the son of Lothar King of Italy.[2] Scarcely was the ceremony accomplished when Lewis advanced claims far exceeding the limits of his regal rights. He demanded that the same authority over Rome should be conceded to him as to the Emperor, and therefore required the oath of fidelity from the Roman nobles. The Romans firmly refused. "This only will I concede," said Sergius, "that the Romans yield the oath to their Lord, the great Emperor Lothar, and neither I nor the Roman nobility will consent that this oath can be tendered to his son." Rome would not sink into a royal city. A solemn oath was again sworn to the Emperor Lothar in S. Peter's, and the attempt of the Italian king to bring the Papacy and city into subjection to himself thus failed.[3] Sergius, how-

Is crowned by the Pope.

[1] *Pontifex a quibusd. audierat, quod in hanc famosiss. Urbem hospitalitatis causa introire voluissent, sed munitis clausisque portis, ut fieret minime concessit. Lib. Pont.* n. 485. There must undoubtedly have been some contract, which forbade the Imperial army being quartered in Rome. Neither would the ancient Romans tolerate the presence of soldiers in the city.

[2] Since Lewis was already King of the Lombards, his coronation in Rome could have been nothing more than a benediction. *Non aveva il Papa alcun diritto per coronare un re d'Italia*, here justly observes De Meo, *Apparato cronolog.* p. 90.

[3] *Quia si vultis, Domino Lothario magno Imp. hoc sacramentum, ut*

ever, consented to appoint Bishop Drogo as Vicar Apostolic in Gaul and Germany. He solemnly recognised the Frankish supremacy in Rome, and Frankish influence was also restored in southern Italy. Precisely at this time Siconolf, Prince of Benevento and Salerno, appeared with a retinue that resembled an army. Harassed by the Saracens, he hastened to Rome to conclude a treaty with Lewis, and pledging himself to a tribute of 10,000 gold soildi, he acknowledged himself vassal to the King of Italy. Lewis soon after departed for Pavia, to the unfeigned joy of the Romans. This was one of the rare moments in the history of the city, when Pope, nobles and people found themselves of one accord, and when the united resistance to the royal will quickened Roman patriotism.[1]

Siconolf in Rome.

Siconolf left the city at the same time. After the murder of his brother Sicard in 840, he had been released from his prison in Taranto, had unsuccessfully laid siege to Benevento, where Radelchis had seized on his brother's throne, and had eventually been obliged to rest satisfied with the possession of Salerno. The fair kingdom of Arichis henceforward remained divided into three parts, Benevento, Salerno and Capua; and the partition served to open a path for

faciant solummodo consentio. Nam Hludovico ejus filio, ut hoc peragatur nec ego, nec omnis Romanor. nobilitas consensit. n. 487.

[1] *Tunc vero laeti omnes cum conjugibus, ac liberis, Senatus Populusq. Rom.* (these ideas, like that of *Quiritum Principes*, now become more general) *ingenti peste liberati—sanct. Sergium Praesulem velut salutis auctorem ac restitutorem pacis venerabantur.* n. 489. The *Liber Pontificalis* here interrupts its valuable account to resume its enumeration of votive gifts.

the Saracens into the heart of Italy. Radelchis himself had summoned these robber hordes to his aid at Bari. They here obtained a secure foothold, whence they made themselves masters of Taranto and devastated the whole of Apulia.

Advance of the Saracens.

While the Arabs thus settled on the southern mainland, the fleets of Kairewan or Palermo scoured the seas, threatened the islands, even occupied some of them. In 845 they seized ancient Misenum in the very face of Naples. But Rome was the goal of their desires. They hoped to plant the flag of the Prophet on S. Peter's, and to enrich themselves with the treasures belonging to the churches with which the city was filled.

They attack and plunder S. Peter's and S. Paul's, 846.

In August 846 a Saracen fleet sailed to the mouth of the Tiber. The papal guards in New Ostia were either overpowered or despised. While one horde advanced to Civita Vecchia another sailed up the river, and at the same time a third detachment forced its way on from Ostia and Portus. Whether or not the Saracens actually attacked Rome we do not know. No chronicler informs us of any attack. Nevertheless, it is probable that the Romans stoutly defended their walls, and that the Vatican and S. Paul's, being unprotected, remained at the mercy of the enemy. The Saxons, Lombards, Frisians and Franks settled in the Borgo must also undoubtedly have made some resistance. They were, however, overpowered, and the Saracens were thus enabled to sack S. Peter's undisturbed.[1] This temple had been hallowed to the

[1] The resistance made by the Schools of Foreigners is shown by *Histor. Ignoti. Cassin.* (*Mon. Germ.* v.): *Saraceni — Oratorium*

whole of Christendom, not only by its five hundred years' existence, but also by the acts of world-historic importance which had taken place within its walls. The footprints of ages, the traces of the earthly life, pilgrimage and death of humanity seemed to be impressed upon its hitherto undesecrated pavement. How many Emperors and Kings, whose names were forgotten and whose realms had passed away, had entered and quitted its doors, and on what solemn occasions. How many Popes rested within its vaults. The reverence of the West knew no more sacred spot. And this treasure-house of the Christian faith, which neither Goths, Vandals, Greeks, nor Lombards had ever touched, was now at the mercy of a brigand horde from Africa.

Imagination fails to realise the wealth of the treasure here accumulated. Since the days of Constantine, the Emperors, the Princes of the West, the Carolingians and the Popes had endowed the basilica with splendid offerings, until S. Peter's might in truth be regarded as the great museum of five centuries of art. Among the objects here collected some were famous on account of their form or historic value. Such were the ancient gold cross on the coffin of the Apostle, the great Pharus of Adrian, and Charles's silver table with the relief of Byzantium.[1] All these

totum devastaverunt b. Princ. Ap. Petri, beatique et Eccl. Pauli, multosq. ibid. peremerunt Saxones. . . . See the inscription from S. Michele in Sassia, quoted in vol. ii., which serves as witness to the tradition.

[1] *Lib. Pont., Vita Benedicti*, n. 576, mentions a *pharum cantharum argenteum sedentem in pedibus quatuor a Saracenis ablatum.* The Romans also perpetrated robberies. The golden cross of Charles had

treasures were carried away by the Saracens. The spoilers even tore the silver plates from the doors, the gold from the floor of the shrine, and carried away the High Altar itself.[1] They violated the grave of the Apostle, and, unable to remove the huge bronze coffin, they broke it open and destroyed or scattered its contents. We must remember that this mysterious vault, according to universal belief, contained the remains of the Prince of the Apostles, whose successors the Bishops of Rome claimed to be, and before whose ashes all peoples and princes came to fall prostrate in the dust. We must bring this belief home to our minds in order fully to understand the atrocity of the outrage and the grief of Christendom.

S. Paul's was also sacked and the tomb of the Apostle likewise devastated.[2] The Romans and the country people undoubtedly offered resistance, but without avail. According to the testimony of the chronicler Benedict, the Saracens attempted to establish themselves in the Vatican territory, and here

been stolen from the Lateran in the time of Paschalis I. *Vita Leonis*, n. 502.

[1] *Portas quas destruxerat Saracena progenies, argentoque nudarat. Lib. Pont.* in Leone IV. n. 540. *Ablatis cum ipso altari quod tumbae memorati apost. principis superpositum fuerat, omnibus ornamentis atque thesauris. Annal. Bertin., A.* 846.

[2] *Vita Bened. III.* n. 568: *Pauli ap. sepulcrum—a Saracenis destructum.* The sack of the two Basilicas: *Vita Leon. IV.* n. 495: *Ecclesiae b. Petri et Pauli a Saracenis funditus depraedatae.—Joh. Diacon. Chron. Neap.* (Muratori, i. p. 2, 315):—*Africani—Ecclesias apostolor. — deripuerunt. Historiola Ignoti Cassin.: Annal. Farf.* (*Mon. Germ.* xiii. 588); *Leo Ostiens.* i. c. 27.—The *Annal. Xant. A.* 846, *Annal. Weissenb. A.* 846, are silent concerning S. Paul's. It is remarkable that the *Lib. Pont.* dismisses the event in a few words.

sacked all the churches. Benedict's statements, however, with regard to a time already distant are confused and inaccurate. He represents the Emperor Lewis as descending from Monte Mario and suffering a disgraceful defeat on the Field of Nero. He extols the Margrave Guido of Spoleto, who, summoned by the Pope, appeared at the head of his valiant Lombards. His forces, in conjunction with the Romans, defeated the infidels in a fierce contest, and pursued them as far as Civita Vecchia.[1] Guido's relief, a desperate struggle in the Borgo, or at the Bridge of S. Peter's (at which point the Mahommedans hoped to gain an entrance), is undoubted. The brigands at length withdrew after they had pillaged the Campagna and levelled the Domuscultae and the bishopric of Silva Candida to the ground. Pursued by Guido, a party of the spoilers with their booty and prisoners made for Civita Vecchia, while another horde departed, spreading devastation along their route, by the Via Appia to Fundi. A storm destroyed several of the pirates' vessels. The waves washed up many of the Saracen corpses, which surrendered the jewels that filled their pockets.[2] The fugitives who had retreated by land were pursued by the Lombard

Guido of Spoleto relieves Rome.

[1] *Bened. Chron.* c. 26: Guido routed the Saracens *a portas Sassie civitas Leoniana*, and *a pontes S. Petri*. It is true that the *Leonina* did not yet exist. Concerning the defeat of Lewis: *propter hoc populi Romani in derisione abuerunt Franci, usque in odiernum diem*. The *Chron. Casin.* c. 9, also gives an account of the defeat of the Franks (4 id. Nov.), but it took place at Gaeta. Martinus Polonus transcribes Benedict as though in the form of an extract. For other passages see Dümmler, *Gesch. des ostfränk. Reichs*, i. 289.

[2] *Annal. Bertin. A.* 847.

army as far as the walls of Gaeta. Here a battle took place, when the arrival of the brave Caesarius, a son of the Magister Militum Sergius of Naples, alone saved the Margrave from defeat. The unfortunate Sergius II. died on January 27, 847, and found a grave in the very cathedral the sack of which had perhaps broken his heart.[1]

2. LEO IV. BECOMES POPE — FIRE IN THE BORGO — LEAGUE OF ROME, NAPLES, AMALFI, AND GAETA AGAINST THE SARACENS—NAVAL VICTORY AT OSTIA, 849 — LEO IV. BUILDS THE CIVITAS LEONINA — ITS WALLS AND GATES — VERSES OVER ITS CHIEF GATES.

On the death of Sergius, Leo, Cardinal of the Quattro Coronati, a Roman of Lombard ancestry, and the son of Radoald, was chosen to fill the vacant throne. The city still lay in dread of the Saracens; the people therefore desired the immediate consecration of the candidate, and Leo IV. was consequently ordained without waiting for the Imperial consent. The urgency of the circumstances may be pleaded in behalf of the Romans, more especially as they sent a letter to the Emperor assuring him of their obedience.[2] Leo IV., 847–855.

[1] Epitaph in Baronius *ad A.* 847. His monument is the Basilica of SS. Martinus and Sylvester, of which he had been Cardinal. He rebuilt the church and added a convent. The building has been greatly altered, and Sergius's mosaics have disappeared.

[2] *Vita Leonis IV.* n. 497. The decrees quoted by Gratianus do not prove, as Baronius believes, that Leo IV. had disputed the right of Imperial consent.

Fire in the Borgo.

An earthquake and a fire added their terrors to the prevailing agitation. The Saxon quarter was reduced to ashes, and the portico of S. Peter's was destroyed. The fire found ready material in the houses of the German settlers, who had either brought with them from their northern homes the custom of covering the roofs with shingles, or, since the city returned in its period of decline to the primitive conditions of its earlier days, had found the usage already existing on their arrival.[1] Religious belief ascribes the escape of the basilica to the prayers of Leo, who quenched the flames by making the sign of the Cross.[2] The recollection of this fire in the "Borgo" was long preserved in the city, and has been immortalised by Raffaelle in a fresco in one of the rooms of the Vatican now known as the "Sala dell' incendio."

The booty which awaited them in Rome meanwhile induced the African pirates to undertake another expedition. While the Romans strengthened their walls and fortified the quarter of S. Peter, news reached them of the preparation of an immense Saracen fleet in Sardinia. It was the year 849. Fortunately at the same time the Southern seaports formed a league—the first in the history of the Middle Ages. Amalfi, Gaeta and Naples, already flourishing

Italian league against the Saracens.

[1] Roofs of shingles were universal during the republican period of ancient Rome. No stamps of tile manufactories have been found earlier than the time of Augustus. De Rossi, *Piante Iconografiche di Roma* (1879), p. 20—The dwellings of the pilgrims had undoubtedly shingle roofs. *Scandula* already appears in edicts of Rothar. *Casa scandalicia* or *scindolica* in diplomas of Farfa, saec. x.; for instance, *una domo solorata scandalicia*, and that in the Field of Mars.

[2] *Vita Leonis*, n. 505.

commercial towns, and almost independent of Byzantium, at the urgent instance of the Pope, had united their galleys and formed a treaty with him. Their vessels assembled opposite Portus to await the appearance of the Saracens, and announced their presence to Rome. The Pope invited Admiral Caesarius and the other captains to the city, where, in the Lateran Palace, they were made to swear fidelity to the league. Leo, at the head of the Roman militia, then proceeded to Ostia to bless the fleet and army.[1] The harbour again found itself enlivened by the presence of valiant warriors, as in the times of Belisarius and Totila. The safety of Rome, menaced by the most formidable of all the enemies of Christendom, was at stake. Leo administered the communion to the troops in the Basilica of S. Aurea, then falling on his knees prayed: "Lord, Thou who savedst Peter from sinking when walking on the waves of the sea, Thou who rescuedst Paul from the depths of the sea when for the third time he suffered shipwreck, mercifully hear us, and by the merits of these Thy saints grant power to the arms of Thy believing servants, who fight against the enemies of Thy Church, that through their victory Thy holy name may be glorified amongst all nations."[2]

[1] *Apostolicus—cum magno armatorum procinctu—Ostiam properavit. Vita Leonis*, n. 522. These were Romans, the Neapolitans not having been left in the city; and previously: *excitavit deus corda Neapolitanorum, Amalphitan., Cajetanorumque, ut una cum romanis contra saracenos dimicare fortiter debuissent.* Hence Sigbert, *Chron. A.* 849: *Romani instantia Leonis papae, auxiliantibus sibi etiam neapolitanis, eos bello excipiunt.*

[2] *Ut de recepto triumpho nomen sanctum tuum in cunctis gentibus*

Naval victory at Ostia, 849.

The solemnity ended, Leo returned to the city, and on the following day the Saracen sails appeared in sight of Ostia. The Neapolitans courageously rowed to meet them; their galleys made an attack. But a sudden storm threw everything into confusion and put an end to hostilities; the enemies' vessels were dispersed or sunk. Many Saracens were shipwrecked on the Tyrrhene Islands, and were there slain. Many fell into the hands of Roman captains, and were either executed in Ostia or carried in chains to Rome. And as the Sicilian Greeks had made use of the Carthaginian captives in building the temples of Agrigentum and Selinus after the great victory at Himera, so the Romans now compelled Saracen prisoners to labour in the erection of the Vatican city.[1] Rome had again slaves of war, and after four hundred years celebrated another triumph. The eye-witness of these events is silent, it is true, concerning the share borne by the Romans in this glorious victory, of which the young Caesarius was the hero. If the column of Duilius, adorned with the rostra of vessels, restored by Tiberius, still remained erect in the ancient Forum, it is scarcely probable that any Roman now understood either its meaning or its inscription; and the victory at Ostia, in which papal galleys had doubtless taken part was celebrated amid solemn thanksgiving

appareat gloriosum. Leo's biographer relates the fact with the precision of an eye-witness.

[1] *Aliquantos . . . ferro constrictos vivere jussimus—et post haec ne otiose, aut sine angustia apud nos viverent aliquando ad murum, quem circa eccl. b. ap. Petri habebamus inceptum, aliquando per diversa artificum opera quicquid necessarium videbatur, per eos omnia jubebamus deferri. Vita*, n. 524.

in the churches as a miracle due to the Prince of the Apostles.[1] Nearly seven centuries later Raffaelle depicted the battle in the same hall of the Vatican with the fire in the Borgo. Fifty years after Raffaelle had painted his fresco, the glory, but by no means the importance, of the battle was revived by the deeds of a Roman admiral at Lepanto, and the Romans again looked with surprise on Mohammedan prisoners of war at work on their ruinous walls, as their ancestors had looked on the Saracens in the time of Leo IV.

A year before the battle of Ostia the Romans had begun the restoration of their walls. The impending danger worked miracles, and the Pope displayed the utmost zeal in superintending the work and in urging haste. All the gates were strengthened and provided with bars. Fifteen towers in ruinous condition were rebuilt; two at the Portuensian Gate, one on each bank of the river, were so constructed that a chain could be stretched from one to the other.[2] But Leo's most celebrated undertaking was the fortification of the Vatican district—an event in the history of the city, for out of this fortification the Civitas Leonina arose, a new quarter of Rome, and a new fortress destined to be of great importance in later centuries.

At the time that Aurelian enclosed the city with

[1] *Super his novis, mysticisque miraculis.* Ivo (*Decr.* x. c. 83) and Gratian. (*Decr.* ii. 23, viii. c. 8) produces a fragment of a letter from Leo to the Emperor, which Guglielmotti (*Storia della Marina Pontificia*, i., Rome, 1856) refers to the battle of Ostia.

[2] *Vita*, n. 516 (Muratori, *ad A.* 846) erroneously places these towers at Portus. These were still to be seen in the time of Flavius Blondus (*Roma Instaur.* i. 37) and also Torrigius (*Le sacre grotte*, p. 524).

walls the necessity of including the Vatican had not arisen. The district remained entirely open and outside the city. Even after the building of S. Peter's, and after convents, hospitals and dwellings of various kinds had grown up around it, and the foreigners' colonies had been founded on its left side, the necessity of building walls for its protection had not presented itself to the mind of any Pope. Hitherto the enemies of Rome had been Christians. Leo III. first conceived the design of protecting the Vatican quarter, and had he carried his idea into execution the basilica could never have been sacked by the Saracens. The work begun by this Pope had been suspended on account of disturbances in the city, and the partially constructed walls had been pulled down by the Romans for the sake of the materials, which were at once appropriated by the populace.[1] Leo IV. revived the project, and worked hard to carry it out. He submitted it to the Emperor Lothar, without whose consent he could not have ventured on so great an undertaking. Lothar readily aided him with money. The expense of the costly enterprise was so distributed that every town in the ecclesiastical State, all the domains both of the Church and the municipality, and the convents, also bore an allotted share.[2]

[1] *Civitatem, quam Leo P. III.—aedificare coeperat, et cujus multis jam in locis fundamenta posuerat licet post suum transitum a quibusdam ablata fuissent hominibus, ita ut nec aditus appareret ubi prius inchoationem praefatus habuerat murus.* *Vita*, n. 542.

[2] *Ut de singulis civitatibus, massisque universis publicis, ac Monasteriis per vices suas generaliter advenire fecisset, sicut et factum est.* I have mentioned the inscription of Capracorum which refers to this

Leo. IV. builds the Leonine City, 848–852.

The Civitas Leonina was begun in 848 and finished in 852. The Vatican territory, or the portico of S. Peter's, was entirely enclosed. Leo's walls stretched from Hadrian's Mausoleum, on which they abutted, sidewards up the Vatican hill, then making a bend encircled S. Peter's, and descending in a straight line again reached the river. These walls, formed of layers of tufa and tiles, were nearly forty feet in height, of proportionate thickness, and were defended by four and forty strong towers. The massive round corner tower which stands on the top of the Vatican hill still affords a specimen of the style of construction. Three gates led into the new city; two in the line of wall which starts from Hadrian's Mausoleum, namely a small gate near this fortress, known as Posterula S. Angeli, the later Porta Castelli, and a larger one near the church of S. Peregrino, hence called Porta S. Perigrini, afterwards Viridaria, Palatii and S. Petri. This was the principal gate of the Leonine city, the gate through which the Emperors made their entrance.[1] The third gate connected the

building. When Gregory IV. built the walls of Ostia, he undertook *partem quandam murorum non modicam cum suis hominibus quasi in sortem.*, n. 476. The *singulae civitates* must be thought of as in the duchy.

[1] *Vita*, n. 534: *super posterulam, ubi mirum in modum castellum praeeminet, quae vocatur S. Angeli;* thus was the Mausoleum of Hadrian called as early as saec. ix. As late as the time of Fulvius this *posterula* led to the meadows of the Vatican. Owing to the constructions of Alexander VI. it fell into disuse; it retained, however, the name of Porta di Castello, a name now borne by the gate which is built up. The Porta S. Peregrini appears to have been also called Aurea in the Middle Ages. Tomassetti, *Della Campagna Rom.*, iv. 366 *f.*—*Viridaria* is explained by the *viridarium novum*, laid out by Nicholas III. between the years 1277 and 1279.

new city with the Trastevere. It was named Posterula Saxonum, from the Saxon quarter in which it stood. It occupied the site of the present Porta di S. Spirito.[1] The line of Leo IV.'s walls, built almost in the form of a horse-shoe, is still in part preserved, and may be traced in the Borgo near the passage of Alexander VI., near the Mint or the papal garden as far as the thick corner tower, also in the line of the Porta Pertusa, and at the point where the walls form a bend between another corner tower and the Porta Fabrica. Owing to the subsequent building of the new Borgo, of the bastions of S. Angelo and S. Spirito, Leo's walls were broken in places and here and there destroyed. The building of the later Vatican walls under Pius IV., which enclose the ancient Leonine city, were the cause of the earlier fortifications suffering in miniature the same fate that the Servian walls had endured in relation to those of Aurelian.

[1] *Super posterulam aliam, quae respicit ad Scholam Saxonum.* The *Mirabilia* do not mention this gate, although they speak of the two others. The *Graphia* does not mention any; the *Anon. Magliab.* the *Viridaria* and *Melonaria* (as Porta Castelli). *Cod. Vatican.* 3851 (description of the Regions of saec. xii. or xiii.) only mentions two gates: *Civitas Leoniana habet turres XLIIII. propugnacula MCCCCXLIIII. Portas duas.* A *Cod. Magliab.* (n. 24, xxii. of the beginning of saec. xvi.) is acquainted with the Gate of S. Spiritus, but calls the Porta Cavalleggieri *posterula Saxon.* We may remember that the wall of the Hadrianeum also had a gate (*S. Petri* or *Aenea*). Three new gates were later made in the wall of the Leonine city: *porta Pertusa*, on the Vatican hill, now walled up; Cavalleggieri (called in Fulvius's time *del torrione*, from the still existing tower of Leo); and the *Fabrica*, now also built up, so that the Leonine city had six gates, or, counting that in the Hadrianeum, seven. Concerning the Leonina and the surrounding walls, see also C. Quarenghi, *Le Mura di Roma con una pianta direttiva* (Rome, 1880).

Leo having finished his work, called the new city Civitas Leonina. The city of Rome, upon which the Popes had now impressed the stamp of their dominion, had for centuries witnessed no festival equal to that now celebrated on the dedication of these walls (June 27, 852). The entire clergy, barefoot, their heads strewn with ashes, walked in procession singing round the walls. First came the seven Cardinal Bishops, who sprinkled these walls with holy water. At each gate the procession halted, and each time the Pope invoked blessings on the new city.[1] The circuit ended, he distributed gifts of gold, silver, and silken palliums among nobles, populace and the colonies of foreigners.

Inscriptions glorified the new foundation. The ancient Romans, who were distinguished beyond other nations for their love of inscriptions (those over the gate of Honorius are still legible), had bequeathed the taste to the Popes. Since the time of Narses, however, the epigrammatic genius of ancient Rome had disappeared. As in churches, so over each of the three gates were placed verses, the Latin of which is barbarous. Two of these inscriptions have been preserved. That over the principal gate, S. Peregrinus, is as follows:

Qui venis ac vadis decus hoc adtende viator,
Quod Quartus struxit nunc Leo papa libens.

[1] The Pope first prayed at the principal gate: . . . *Deus—hanc civitatem, quam noviter te adjuvante fundavimus, fac ab ira tua in perpetuum manere securam, et de hostibus, quorum causa constructa est, novos ac multiplices habere triumphos.* Then at the Porta S. Angeli, and lastly at the posterula. (*Lib. Pont.*) Platina confuses these prayers *super portam* with actual inscriptions.

Marmore praeciso radiant haec culmina pulchra,
Quae manibus hominum aucta (?) decore placent.
Caesaris invicti quod cernis iste Holothari,
Praesul tantum ovans tempore gessit opus.
Credo malignorum tibi jam non bella nocebunt,
Neque triumphus erit hostibus ultra tuis.
Roma capud orbis splendor spes aurea Roma,
Praesulis ut monstrat en labor alma tui
Civitas haec a Conditoris sui nomine Leonina vocatur.

Over the gate of the fortress:

Romanus Francus Bardusque viator et omnis
Hoc qui intendit opus cantica digna canant.
Quod bonus Antistes quartus Leo rite novavit
Pro patriae ac plebis ecce salute suae.
Principe cum summo gaudens haec cuncta Holotharo,
Perfecit cujus emicat altus honor.
Quos veneranda fides nimio devinxit amore
Hos Deus omnipotens perferat arce poli.
Civitas Leonina vocatur.[1]

This new city was dedicated by the Pope to the Saviour, and placed under the protection of SS. Peter and Paul, whose likenesses were represented, together with that of Leo himself, on altar coverings. Pilgrims still continued to dwell in the quarter. Romans or Trasteverines were induced by various advantages to settle there. The foundation of the Leonine city marks an epoch in the monumental history of mediaeval Rome as well as in the annals of papal supremacy, which now for the first time had enlarged the circuit of the civic Pomoerium.[2]

[1] Both inscriptions are given in Muratori, Diss. xxvi. De Rossi has emended the text *Inscr. Christ. Urbis R.*, vol. ii. (1888) pars i. p. 326.

[2] I find the new city mentioned for the first time in Dipl. xiii., in Marini, *A.* 854: *infra hanc nostram nova civit. Leonina.*

3. LEO IV. FORTIFIES PORTUS, AND ENTRUSTS THE CARE OF THE HARBOUR TO A COLONY OF CORSICANS —BUILDS LEOPOLIS NEAR CENTUMCELLAE—CIVITA VECCHIA—RESTORES HORTA AND AMERIA—BUILDS CHURCHES IN ROME—HIS VOTIVE GIFTS—WEALTH OF THE TREASURY OF THE CHURCH—FRASCATI.

Rebuilding of Portus.

Gregory IV. had restored Ostia; Leo IV. rebuilt Portus. The celebrated harbour of Rome had almost disappeared, surviving merely on the strength of its ancient bishopric as a shadow and a name in the marshes of the Tiber. Its church of S. Hippolytus on the sacred island, and the church of S. Nymfa on the shore, still, however, endured. After the last remaining inhabitants had fled in terror of the Saracens, Leo beheld the utter ruin of the harbour with dismay. He built new walls round the town, and erected new buildings within it. Corsicans, driven from the island by the Arabs, fortunately arrived at this crisis as heaven-sent colonists. A formal treaty was entered into, and Rome again established a colony. After Portus with its territories, cattle and horses had been ceded to the Corsicans by means of papal charters, and under the sanction of the Emperors Lothar and Lewis, the islanders entered the city as free proprietors and vassals of the Church and S. Peter in the year 852. But Portus never revived. The young colony soon fell a prey to fever, or to the sword of the Saracen, and the remainder of its history is shrouded in utter darkness.[1]

[1] The *praeceptum pontificale* contains the rights and duties of the

Restoration of Centumcellae.

The harbour of Trajan had already changed into a lagoon or swamp. No ship ever entered it; and if trading boats ventured to Latium, they followed the course of the Tiber along the Ostian bank. Trajan's other harbour, Centumcellae, on the contrary, still retained some degree of animation during the time of Pipin and Charles. In 813 the Saracens, however, had already attacked the old Tuscan town, and later, apparently in 829, had destroyed it. Fears were entertained that Centumcellae would share the fate of Luni, which had been razed to the ground by the Mohammedans in 849. The harbour on the Tiber was deserted and choked with sand, the walls were overthrown, and the fugitive inhabitants had been living for forty years in the caverns of the neighbouring mountains. Centumcellae seemed so hopelessly abandoned to destruction that Leo. IV. allowed it to remain in ruins, and attempted to establish its inhabitants on another settlement, twelve miles further inland. He set to work with indefatigable energy, and churches, houses, walls and gates arose at his nod. The new city was consecrated with ceremonies similar to those observed in the consecration of the Leonina in the eighth year of his pontificate, and was named Leopolis.[1] But neither name nor place endured. The inhabitants of Leopolis yearned for the home they had forsaken; and

Corsicans. The farms had been chiefly the property of the Papal Exchequer, some in the possession of convents and private individuals. We may observe the turn of the expression *pontificale eis, quod secundo promiserat ob serenissimorum Lotharii et Ludovici majorum Imperatorum, suamque simul mercedem, perpetuamque memoriam, præceptum emisit.*

[1] *Vita*, n. 584.

it is said that Leander, a respected veteran, summoned them in a council to return to their former city. They obeyed, and Centumcellae was henceforth named Civitas Vetus (Civita Vecchia).[1] Tarquinia also was probably, like other Etruscan towns, destroyed at this time by the Saracens, but in the course of time Corneto arose upon its site.[2]

Leo IV. restored two other Tuscan towns, Horta and Ameria, or at least provided them with walls and gates. Fortifications, henceforward, proved the only means of keeping the inhabitants together. For while the Saracens pillaged the entire coasts of Etruria and Latium, undefended places, particularly those in the plains, frequently became deserted. Their inhabitants fled to the rocks and summits of the mountains; and with the beginning of the Moslem raids in the early part of the ninth century the numerous fortresses and towers, which were later converted into feudal strongholds, arose on the Roman Campagna.

Churches built by Leo IV.

The renown of the cities founded by Leo cast into shade the fame of the churches which he built in Rome. Nevertheless the Pope showed great zeal with regard to churches also. The fire in the Borgo

[1] Frangipani (*Istoria di Civita-vecchia*) thinks that the inhabitants of Leopolis returned about the year 940. Guglielmotti (i. 42) holds it to have been about 889, and believes Centumcellae to have been destroyed in 829; the forty years of exile, however, and the building of Leopolis in the eighth year of Leo IV., give the date of 813. *Annal. Einhard. ad A.* 813, *Mauri Centumcellas—vastaverunt.* A place named Cincelli existed near Tolfa, and it is probable that this was Leopolis.

[2] The date of the origin of Corneto is uncertain; it appears that as early as the 6th saec., before Tarquinia was entirely destroyed, a place of this name existed on this very spot. Luigi Dasti, *Notiz. storiche arch. di Tarquinia e Corneto* (Rome, 1878).

had worked immense havoc. The old basilica of the Saxons, S. Maria, had apparently been destroyed. It was rebuilt by the Pope on the spot where the church of S. Spirito now stands. Leo probably also restored the Frisian Church of S. Michele in Sassia, behind which ran the new wall. Tradition at least asserts that he built S. Michele in remembrance of those Saxons who had been slain by the swords of the unbelievers. He further rebuilt the injured portico of S. Peter's and restored the atrium.

Sumptuous restoration of the church furniture.

The Saracen sack compelled the Pope to replace the church jewels. The money lavished on this work enables us to form some idea of the incalculable wealth of the Church treasury. Leo covered the high altar with plates of gold set with precious stones, which displayed among many other portraits those of himself and Lothar, probably in enamel. One of these golden tables weighed two hundred and sixteen pounds; a silver-gilt crucifix, set with amethysts and diamonds, weighed seventy pounds; a silver ciborium over the altar, adorned with pillars and gilt lilies, no less than one thousand six hundred and six pounds; a cross of massive gold, glittering with pearls, emeralds and opals, was one thousand pounds in weight. There were besides vases, censers, lamps hung on silver chains and garnished with golden balls, chalices set with jewels, lecterns or reading desks of wrought silver, and the new covering of the doors with "many plates of light-diffusing silver, on which sacred histories were represented."[1] To these we may add the tapes-

[1] *Vita*, n. 540; the official epithets: *mirae magnitud. et pulchritud., inclyta operatione celatum*, which he generally gives to the vessels, are not without foundation.

tries and hangings for the columns and doors; further, the silken vestments of the priests, valuable no less as products of art than for their costliness, displaying as they did the most elaborate embroideries, entire histories, arabesques crowded with figures, representations of plants and animals, and being as a rule set with pearls and precious stones.[1] The use of so many Oriental stuffs of silk and purple velvet, and of pearls and precious stones, shows how great was the intercourse which Italy maintained with the East. This intercourse was carried on in the South by means of the Neapolitans, and by the inhabitants of Gaeta and Amalfi through the Saracens themselves. The same infidels who had sacked S. Peter's and S. Paul's tore the jewels out of the sacred vessels which had fallen into their hands, and, through the Jews, sold them back to the Pope. They brought the metals and pearls of Asia and Africa to the Roman Church, while the Venetians in the North drove a like traffic with Rome through Byzantium.[2]

These costly votive offerings were not bestowed on S. Peter's alone. S. Paul's, which had likewise been sacked, several other churches of the city, and even of the provinces, were enriched in proportion; and

[1] The embroidery of stuffs (*opus plumarium*) was assuredly carried on in the neighbourhood of S. Peter's to the same extent as the mosaic art is in the mosaic manufactory at the present day. The *Chron.* of Farfa, p. 469, mentions a factory of the kind in saec. x.: *Curtem S. Benedicti in Silva Plana, ubi fuit antiquitus congregatio ancillarum, quae opere plumario ornamenta ecclesiae laborabant.* Hoods (*cappae Romanae*) and gold girdles (*cingula Romano opere*) are mentioned in the *Chron. Fontanell.* in Dachery, ii. c. 17, 280, as costly gifts.

[2] W. Heyd, *Geschichte des Levantehandels im Mittelalter*, 1879, i. 104 *f.*

Wealth of the Ecclesiastical Treasury.

Rome, on the score of her Assyrian luxury, might justly have been termed the "golden." The additional sums spent by Leo IV. on the building of the Leonina, on the towns of Portus, Leopolis, Horta and Ameria, show that the treasury of the Church was richer at this time than in the days of Leo X., the vast sums spent by the earlier Leo having been derived chiefly from the direct revenues of the State, not as yet enriched by constant subsidies from foreign countries, by legacies, or by gifts. The Popes did not in this age accumulate wealth for themselves, and the extravagance of nepotism was still unknown. The life of the Curia had not entirely shaken off the discipline of the cloister. Hence it followed that the ecclesiastical coffers remained full, and that it was possible to devote the wealth of the Church to great and beneficent aims.

Rebuilding of the Quattro Coronati and of S. Maria Nuova.

Leo IV. rebuilt the Quattro Coronati, of which he had been Cardinal. But the burning of Rome in the time of Robert Guiscard at the end of the eleventh century destroyed the structure, and but few remains are preserved in the church more lately restored.[1] Leo also rebuilt the church of S. Maria (hitherto called Antiqua, but henceforward known as Nova) on the Via Sacra. This church, which stands in the ruins of the Temple of Venus and Rome, and close to the Arch of Titus, received the name of S. Francesca Romana in the seventeenth century. Nicholas I., who finished

[1] The passage behind the tribune was built by Leo IV., and a marble tablet commemorates the saint whose remains he caused to be interred there.

the building, decorated the tribune with mosaics. It is scarcely possible, however, that those which now remain are the mosaics of the ninth century.[1]

Leo's care was extended to the churches and convents of other towns as well. Some of these deserve mention—as, for instance, the convents of Benedict and Scholastica at Subiaco (at that time still called Sub Lacu); the monastery of Sylvester on Soracte; churches in Fundi, Terracina and Anagni; also in Frascati, which now for the first time appears in history. The name is used to denote a place apparently already populous, several churches being mentioned. Hence it follows that as early as the ninth century the town on the Alban hills now known as Frascati was already built and was called by its present name.[2] Frascati.

4. LEWIS II. CROWNED EMPEROR — DEPOSITION OF CARDINAL ANASTASIUS — ETHELWOLF AND ALFRED IN ROME—TRIAL OF DANIEL, THE MAGISTER MILITUM, BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL OF LEWIS II.—DEATH OF LEO IV., 855—FABLE OF POPE JOAN.

The Saracen War and the buildings of the Pope cast all other events in Rome into the background, and

[1] The *Lib. Pont.* three times speaks of the church as a building of Leo IV. : n. 568, 569, 592. S. Maria Antiqua was undoubtedly transformed into S. Maria Nova by Leo IV.—Ciampini, &c. (c. 28) believes the present mosaics to be those of 848. The many deviations, however, from the character of this period, and the inscription in Leonine verses, speak in favour of a later century.

[2] *Basilica S. Sebastiani, quae in Frascatis consistit.*, *Lib. Pont.* n. 515—n. 529 : *S. Maria, quae ponitur in Frascata* ; n, 546 : *S. Vincentii, quae ponitur in Frascata.*

during Leo's reign there are, indeed, but few to chronicle. In 850, after Lothar had, according to custom, already crowned Lewis publicly before the general Imperial Diet, the Pope placed the crown upon his head in S. Peter's. The precise date of the coronation is unknown.[1] The new Emperor made war against the Saracens in the South; in 852 he laid siege to Bari. He thence returned to Northern Italy, and the Romans complained to Lothar that he had done nothing for their defence.[2] A Council which was assembled to discuss matters of discipline in December 853 arrested public attention for a time; for here Anastasius, Cardinal of S. Marcellus, was condemned and deprived of his sacerdotal dignities Anastasius had entirely neglected his church for five years, and had failed to appear in answer to the papal citation. Excommunicated in the spring, he had escaped to Aquileja; and the Emperor, from whom Leo demanded his surrender, had search made for him in vain.[3] The incident shows the height to which the arrogance of such presbyters as were called cardinals, and from whose midst the Popes had for some time past been elected, had risen. They gradually supplanted the influence of the ministers of the palace until they afterwards became the commanding Sacred College or Ecclesiastical Senate.

Leo IV. crowns Lewis II. Emperor, 850.

[1] The only information concerning it is found in *Annal. Bertin.*: *Lotharius filium suum Hludovicum Romam mittit, qui a Leone papa honorifice susceptus, et in imperatorem unctus est.* Muratori disputes Pagi's date of December 2.

[2] *Annal. Bertin. A.* 853.

[3] The documents in Baronius, *A.* 853, n. xxxv., Labbé, *Concil.* ix. p. 1134, and the inscriptions of Leo IV. in S. Peter's in *Annal. Bertin. A.* 868.

The Pope was soon gladdened by the arrival of two British princes. Ethelwolf came to Rome to be anointed and crowned by Leo himself, and with Ethelwolf was Alfred, his youthful son, who was later, as sage and hero, to shed immortal lustre on his crown. The Anglo-Saxon colony, which had suffered so heavily by the fire, reaped great advantages from the twelve months' sojourn of these princes, the liberal king providing his countrymen with the means of rebuilding their dwellings. He also confirmed Peter's pence to the Roman Church, and the tribute henceforward became a regular tax paid to Rome by the English people.[1]

Ethelwolf crowned in Rome by the Pope.

The end of Leo's life was embittered by a contest which shows in what great degree Rome was dependent on the Emperor. Daniel, the Magister Militum, with the object of compassing the ruin of his enemy Gratian, had brought serious accusations against him before Lewis. Gratian, Commander-in-Chief, and at the same time Papal Consiliar and Superista, was accused of a treasonable alliance with the Greeks.[2] Since the Saracens had sacked their chief sanctuaries, the Romans had given utterance to speeches, bitter

[1] Woker, *Das kirchl. Finanzwesen der Päpste*, p. 35.—A treasure was discovered in the Atrium of the Vestals on the Palatine in 1883, which contained 830 Anglo-Saxon silver pennies, the tribute of Rome-scot from the last decades of the ninth until the middle of the tenth century. Among these coins are pennies of King Alfred, of Edward, Athelstan, Edmund, Sitric, Anlaf. This treasure was buried here in the time of Pope Marinus II. (942–946). De Rossi, *D'un tesoro di Monete anglo-sassoni trovato nell' atrio delle vestali* (Lincei, *Notizie degli scavi Dic.* 1883).

[2] He is called (*Lib. Pont.* n. 554) *Romani palatii egregius superista, ac consiliarius*, and *Romanae urbis superista.*

enough, against the Emperor. They scoffed at the impotent Frankish Empire which had been instituted for the defence of Rome and the Church, and asserted that it would be preferable to restore the Empire to the Byzantines. To such critics the Emperor might have shown the cinders of many Frankish cities, and the ruins of the palace of Aachen itself, which he had been unable to defend against the Normans. Lewis had already experienced the temper which prevailed in Rome. The Pope himself had been accused of dealings against the Constitution of the Empire, or of devising innovations. He had justified his conduct in writing, and declared his willingness to subject himself to any tribunal, were he found guilty of offending against the laws of the Empire. Had this not previously taken place, the accusations of one isolated Roman would never have excited to such a degree the wrath of Lewis.[1]

Lewis establishes his Tribunal in Rome.

"Inflamed with unbounded wrath," and without notifying his coming to the Pope, he hastened to Rome. Leo received him with all due honour, and tranquilly awaited the issue of the trial. The Imperial Placitum was held in the Palace of Leo III., beside S. Peter's, and Pope and Emperor, the Roman and Frankish nobility assembled together. Accusers, accused and witnesses appeared. Daniel was convicted of the most audacious falsehoods, and given

[1] In connection with this we must refer to the two fragments of letters which are ascribed to Leo IV.; Gratian. c. ix. dist. 10: *De capitulis vel praeceptis imperialibus—irrefragabiliter custodiendis*, and Pars 2, caus. 2, qu. 7: *Nos si incompetenter aliquid egimus, et subditis justae legis tramitem non conservavimus, vestro, ac Missorum vestrorum cuncta volumus emendare judicio*, &c.

into the custody of the maligned Gratian. The Emperor, however, requested and obtained his pardon.

A few days after the trial Leo IV. died on July 17, 855. He shines like a second Aurelian in the history of the city for the work which he accomplished in the restoration and extension of his walls; and with perfect justice he might have termed himself *Restaurator Urbis*. His memory still survives in the Leonine city.

Fable of Pope Joan.

One of the strangest myths born of mediaeval imagination gives the energetic Leo an adventurous woman as successor; and through a course of several centuries, historians, bishops, even Popes and the world at large remained under the belief that for two years the chair of Peter had been filled by Pope Joan. The legend lies outside the sphere of historic fact, although not outside the domain of mediaeval belief. It must therefore be given in brief. A beautiful girl, who, though born at Ingelheim, was the daughter of an Englishman, was distinguished by her unusual genius in the schools of Mainz. Being beloved by a young scholar, she concealed her sex under the monastic habit which she adopted in Fulda, where her lover lived as a Benedictine. Together they studied the Humanities and together travelled to England and Athens, where the disguised Joan frequented the higher schools of the philosophers, with which, according to the fancy of the chroniclers, the city was yet filled. Here her companion died, and Joan or John Anglicus, as she called herself, came to Rome. Her attainments procured her a professorship in the School of the Greeks (for into the School

of the Greeks fable transforms the diaconate known to us under the name of S. Maria Scholae Graecorum). She awoke the enthusiasm of the Roman philosophers, charmed the Cardinals, all unsuspicious of her sex, and became the marvel of Rome. Her ambition, however, soared to the Papacy. On the death of Leo IV., the cardinals unanimously voted that no one was so fitted to preside over Christendom as John Anglicus, the ideal of every theological perfection. The female Pope entered the Lateran, but stooped to an intrigue with a confidential attendant. The result remained concealed under the ample pontifical vestments until nature betrayed the sinner. On the procession to the Lateran she was overtaken by the pangs of labour between the Colosseum and S. Clement's, she gave birth to a boy and died.[1] The horrified Romans buried her on the spot, and there erected a statue which represented a beautiful woman, the papal tiara on her head, and a child in her arms, as a monument of the monstrous event. Henceforward the Popes avoided the spot when on the way to take possession of the Lateran, and submitted to an official examination on the Sella Stercoraria, a perforated marble seat in the portico of the Lateran.[2]

[1] *Papa Pater Patrum Peperit Papissa Papellum*, says one of the inventive authors. Thus was explained an ancient inscription, which refers to a priest of Mithras (*Pater Patrum*), but which was believed instead to apply to the female Pope. An ancient statue representing a woman with a child stood on the Lateran Way, and for centuries was believed to be the likeness of Pope Joan. It was only removed by Sixtus V.

[2] Platina in Joh. VIII., as he calls the female Pope. *Sella stercoraria* was actually the chair on which the Pope took possession of the

This vulgar fable—the offspring of ignorance, and the passion for romance—perhaps also owed its origin in part to the hatred cherished by the Romans towards the temporal rule of the Popes. We cannot fail to recognise in it the age of the *Mirabilia*, which, however, contain no mention of the story, or the spirit of the thirteenth century, in the middle of which it arose. It was first introduced as an interpolation in some manuscripts of Martinus Polonus and of Marianus Scotus. It was thence handed on to all the chroniclers, and was so universally accepted, that about the year 1400 the bust of Pope Joan was unhesitatingly placed in the series of papal portraits on the walls of the cathedral of Siena. The incredible simplicity of an age, in which no fable or tradition was subjected to the test of criticism, protected the likeness in that cathedral, and for two hundred years it stood there among the Popes undisputed, bearing the inscription "Johannes VIII., a woman from England." It was finally removed by Clement VIII. at the instance of Cardinal Baronius, when the female

Lateran. Cencius (Mabill., *Mus. It.* ii. 211) thus explains the custom: *ducitur a cardinalib. ad sedem lapideam, quae sedes dicitur Stercoraria, quae est ante porticum basil. Salvatoris patriarchatus Lateranensis: et in ea eumdem electum—ponunt, ut vere dicatur:* "*Suscitat de pulvere egenum. et de stercore erigit pauperem, ut sedeat cum principibus, et solium gloriae teneat.*" The Pope also sat on two perforated porphyry seats in the chapel of S. Sylvester in the Lateran; on one he received the keys of the basilica, on the other he gave them back to the Prior. (Mabill., *Iter. Ital.* i. 57.) The curious custom survived until the end of the fifteenth century. Such a sella of red marble may still be seen in the Vatican Museum. In the Christian inscriptions of the Vatican I have read: *Stercoriae filiae*—a horrible name for a girl.

figure was transformed into the likeness of Pope Zacharias.[1]

[1] Since the time of the Reformation Catholics and Protestants have assailed each other with dissertations concerning this legend, so that a mythical woman has become the subject of a greater number of biographies than the most celebrated queens of history. Even Friedr. Spanheim upheld the fact in a treatise on which was based Lenfant's *Histoire de la Papesse Jeanne* (La Haye, 1720). Leo Allatius had previously written his *Confutatio fabulae de Joanna Papissa* (Colon. 1653), and David Blondel murders the female pope in a French work and *De Johanna Papissa* (Amstel. 1627). Leibnitz, Eckhart, Labbé, Baronius, Pagi, Bayle, Launoy, Novaes wrote lengthy confutations; and even in our own time Bianchi Giovini composed an *Esame Critico degli atti e documenti relativi alla favola della Papessa Giovanna* (Milan, 1845). The last of these treatises is Dollinger's "Die Päpstin Johanna" in the *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1863). I note as important for Numismatics: Garampius *de Nummo Argenteo Benedict III.* (Rome, 1749). The coin has on its obverse *Hlotharius Imp*; since it was struck under this Emperor; it proves that Benedict III. was the immediate successor of Leo IV.

CHAPTER IV.

1. Benedict III. elected Pope—Tumult in Rome on account of the Election—Invasion of Cardinal Anastasius—Firmness of the Romans towards the Imperial Legates—Benedict III. ordained September 29, 855 — Lewis II. sole Emperor — Friendly Relations between Rome and Byzantium.

The papal election which followed the death of Leo IV. threw the city into great confusion. The majority of the Romans chose Benedict, Cardinal of S. Calixtus, and conducted him in procession to the Lateran. The decree of election was signed by clergy and nobility, in order that "according to ancient custom" it might then be presented to the Emperor for ratification.[1] Nicholas, Bishop of Anagni, and the Magister Militum Mercurius were chosen as the bearers. But while on their way Arsenius of Eugubium succeeded in changing their determination. Arsenius was the friend of Cardinal Anastasius, who, although supended by Leo IV., still remained power-

Benedict III., Pope, 855–858.

[1] This proceeding is thus mentioned for the first time, as it was practised in Byzantine times: *Decretum componentes propriis manibus roborarunt et consuetudo prisca ut poscit, invictissimis Lothario, ac Ludovico destinaverunt Augustis.* *Lib. Pont.* in Bened. III., n. 558.

ful, and, striving to reach the papal crown, maintained a party in Rome. Arsenius won the nuncios over to his side, and at the court of Lewis they upheld the cause of Anastasius. Returning to Rome, where the cardinal had already arrived, they announced the approach of the Imperial envoys, and concerted their plans with Anastasius and his faction. The heads of the party were the Magistri Militum Gregory and Christophorus, and the Bishops Radoald of Portus and Agatho of Todi. Meanwhile the messengers of the Emperor, Counts Bernard and Adalbert, arrived at Horta. Anastasius hastened to meet them, followed by Nicholas and Mercurius, Radoald and Agatho. Together they left for Rome. At the basilica of S. Leucius, at the fifth milestone they encountered the messengers of Benedict, the elected Pope, and loaded them with chains. Benedict forthwith sent out a Dux and Secundicerius.

The Missi of the Emperor—we may observe with what authority they confronted Rome—commanded clergy, nobles, and people to appear next day at S. Leucius to receive the Imperial injunctions. The Romans hastening to obey the command, were met by the Imperial Counts, Anastasius and his followers, bringing the Superista Gratian and the Scrinarius Theodore as prisoners in their train. The cavalcade rode amid the clank of arms across the Neronian Field and through the gate of S. Peregrinus into the Leonine city. Rome was in a state of wild excitement. While the elected Pope awaited the issue of events in the Lateran, Anastasius forced his way into S. Peter's, and indulged his revenge and his heretical

Cardinal Anastasius attacks the Pope.

iconoclastic instincts. In accordance with ancient custom, Leo IV. had caused a picture of the Synod which had deposed the rebellious cardinal to be painted over the door of the sacristy. Anastasius destroyed not only the picture itself, but burnt effigies of the saints, and with a hatchet cut down even the images of Christ and the Virgin.[1] He then hastened with his friends to the Lateran, commanded the doors of the palace to be broken open, and took his seat on the papal chair; while Benedict, surrounded by his faithful clergy, occupied another throne in the basilica itself. Anastasius ordered Benedict to be forcibly ejected, and Bishop Romanus of Bagnorea forced a way into the church with a band of armed men, dragged Benedict from the throne, tore the papal vestments from him, and otherwise maltreated him. Benedict was then handed over to some Cardinals, who had likewise been degraded by Leo IV. This happened on September 21, 855.

As soon as the tidings spread, many of the clergy and citizens hastened to the Chapel Sancta Sanctorum, and with shrieks threw themselves on the ground. The following day Benedict's followers, encouraged by the attitude of the people, met in the Basilica Aemiliana. The threats of the Imperial counts, who, with weapons in their hands, forced their way into the presbyterium of the church, failed to induce them to

[1] *Imagines enim confregit, ignique concremavit, et Synodum, quam supra sanctuarii januas b. memor. Leo pingi Papa jusserat destruxit.*, n. 561. Concerning the picture of Synod, see *Annal. Bertin. A.* 868. There were many Iconoclasts among the Frankish bishops, such as Claudius of Turin (died 839), against whom Dungalus wrote, and Agobard of Lyons (died 840). Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* ii. 1, p. 93, &c.

accept the anti-pope. On Tuesday, at another meeting in the Lateran, the unanimous voice of the people was given in favour of the canonically-elected Benedict. The envoys yielded. Anastasius was driven with ignominy from the Patriarchium and Benedict brought forth with rejoicing from the custody in which he had been detained, placed on the horse of Leo IV., and led in procession to S. Maria Maggiore. A three days' fast was ordained as penance; the followers of Anastasius threw themselves at the feet of the Pope to sue for mercy, and on the 29th of September, in presence of the Imperial envoys, Benedict III. received consecration in S. Peter's.[1]

Benedict III. is recognised.

These events heralded one of the most dreadful periods in the history of the Papacy. They brought to light the ever-increasing differences in the city, the factions which severed populace and nobility, the ambitions of rebellious cardinals, the difficult position of the Church towards the Empire. The extraordinary conduct of the Imperial Legates, who endeavoured by force to place a cardinal, previously solemnly condemned by a decree of the Synod, upon the Apostolic Chair, shows that the Emperor still retained the impression which the trial between Daniel and Gratian had left upon his mind, and was still filled with distrust. It further shows that he was not anxious for the rule of an energetic Pope such as Leo IV., but on

[1] *Imperialibus missis cernentibus, in Apostolica sede, ut mos est, et antiqua traditio dictat, consecratus, ordinatusque est Pontifex. Vita Ben.*, n. 566. The diploma of Lewis is therefore false, here exclaims Pagi. In spite of these events, Anastasius was absolved by Nicholas I., but again excommunicated by Adrian II.

the contrary, hoped to see the Chair of Peter filled by a creature who would prove subservient to himself. His project was frustrated, however, by the firmness of the Romans, and only served to undermine Imperial prestige.

The very day after the ordination of the new Pope Lewis became sole Emperor. Lothar had divided his empire between his sons. Weary and ill, tortured by the stings of conscience (the shade of his father haunted him), he had assumed the Benedictine cowl at Prüm, near Treves, and had there died on September 28.[1] Rome remained unmoved by the event. Her history during the short reign of Benedict III. is utterly uneventful. Repeated disastrous inundations of the Tiber are recorded in the papal chronicles. The biography of the Pope is filled, however, with lists of votive gifts and restorations of churches, among which the rebuilding of S. Paul's grave, destroyed by the Saracens, deserves remark.

Benedict maintained a friendly intercourse with Byzantium. The Emperor Michael, on his part, sent Lazarus, monk and painter, to Rome, who presented to the Pope a copy of the Gospels sumptuously bound

[1] See the long epitaph in Baronius, *A.* 855. Although Baronius says that this inscription has been erroneously attributed to Henry III., I nevertheless hold it to be Henry's. It bears internal evidence of the later period. The opening lines—

Caesar tantus eras quantus et orbis,
At nunc exigua clauderis urna—

are found word for word in the *Mirabilia* as the inscription on the fabulous grave of Caesar on the obelisk of the Vatican. Baronius is acquainted with another epitaph, which says of Lothar: *qui Francis, Italis, Romanis praefuit ipsis.*

and adorned with miniatures. The costly volume was doubtlessly a work of the monk's own hands.[1]

2. Nicholas I., Pope—He Reduces the Archbishop of Ravenna to subjection—The Greek Schism of Photius breaks out—Relations of Rome to the Bulgarians—Visit of the Envoys of King Boris to Rome—Formosus goes as Missionary to Bulgaria—Attempt to make the Country a Province of the Roman Church—The Bulgarian Constitution of Nicholas I.

Nicholas I., Pope, 858–867.

Benedict III. died on April 8, 858, precisely as Lewis, who had come to Rome for unknown reasons, had left the city. The Emperor immediately returned, with the object of preventing by his presence any illegalities in the election, and with the further object of defending his own rights. He induced the Romans to give their united votes in favour of the deacon Nicholas, a distinguished man of noble family and son of the Regionary Theodore. The candidate was consecrated in presence of the Emperor on April 24 in S. Peter's, and Lewis, having attended the ordination festival, left the city.[2] The regard which he

[1] *Michael—Imp.—misit ad b. Petrum Apost. donum per manum Lazari Monachi et Pictoriae artis nimie eruditi, genere vero, Chazai, i. e. Evangelium*, &c. The name of Lazarus may be regarded as one of the oldest names in the history of art. I may remark in passing that glass-painting was at this time practised in Rome: *fenestras vero vitreis coloribus ornavit*, says the *Lib. Pont.* n. 572, on the occasion of Benedict's restorations in S. Maria in Trastevere.

[2] *Praesente Cesare consecratus est*, says the *Vita Nicol. I.*, and the

showed for Nicholas, who had many opponents among the clergy, and the gratitude which the Pope hastened to testify, allow us to suppose that some personal tie subsisted between the two men. The Emperor on leaving Rome halted at S. Leucius, where the ruins of the Torre del Quinto now stand, and here Nicholas with the principal clergy and nobility came to visit him. The Emperor hastened to meet the Pope, led his horse some distance by the bridle, entertained him in his tent, loaded him with presents, and, when the Pope took his leave, again humbled himself to lead his horse. And with this haughty attitude in presence of an Emperor who so far forgot his dignity, Nicholas entered on his pontificate.

Events of the gravest nature made his reign an arduous one. The national churches now began to assert themselves in opposition to the growing monarchy of the Papacy. Nicholas, however, showed a resolute front to kings as well as bishops, thundered excommunications against Constantinople, and like Gregory the Great bestowed wise constitutions upon barbarian races. Before his authoritative countenance neither the Roman barons nor cardinals dared assert themselves.

Ravenna resists Rome.

Ravenna showed itself refractory in the first year of his reign. John, the Archbishop, aimed at independence within his territory, where he treated laymen and clergy as their sovereign, confiscated property, excommunicated bishops, and forbade them or the papal officials to go to Rome. He explained to the

Annal. Bertin.: praesentia magis ac favore Hludovici regis et procerum ejus quam cleri electione substituitur (*A.* 858).

Papal nuncios that the Archbishop of Ravenna was not obliged to appear before a Roman Synod. Nicholas summoned him three times in vain and excommunicated him. John journeyed to Lewis at Pavia, and, accompanied by the Emperor's Legates, proceeded to Rome. Nicholas, however, resolutely declined all intercession on the part of the Emperor, and the Archbishop left the city. Envoys from the Emilia and the Ravennese nobility now invited the Pope to come in person to their province to protect them from the despotism of the Archbishop and his brother George.[1] John, who did not expect the arrival of the Pope, again went to the Emperor, while Nicholas in person tranquillised the Ravennese by the restoration of their property. The Archbishop made his submission; the Pope granted him absolution, but at the same time imposed on him the duty of appearing in Rome once a year. He forbade him to consecrate bishops in the Emilia without permission of the Sacred Chair, and until the candidates had been elected by the papal Dux, clergy, and people.[2] He forbade him also to extort tribute from these bishops, or to prevent their coming to Rome; and ordained that all disputes were to be submitted to the sentence of the tribunal of Ravenna, a tribunal which the Papal Missus and the Vestararius of the

[1] *Et ecce Aemilienses, ac Senatores urbis Ravennae cum innumero populo, Lib. Pont.* n. 588. The term *Senatus* as applied to the nobility is of frequent occurrence in the biographies of the Popes after the time of Charles the Great.

[2] *Nisi post Electionem Ducis, Cleri, et populi* (n. 591). The papal duces in the larger cities, which were also the seats of bishops, took part in the episcopal elections; the Ordo had disappeared.

city must attend.[1] After having signed the decrees of the Synod, John left Rome, and Nicholas scored a signal victory as temporal ruler in the Emilia and Pentapolis.

Dispute with Photius in Byzantium.

The dispute with Constantinople which began about the same time was, however, more serious. It led to an irreconcilable schism, and put the last stroke to the division between Rome and the Greek Empire. These events, in which the names of Photius and Ignatius shine conspicuous, lie, however, outside the history of the city, and can therefore be touched upon but briefly.[2] Owing to the intrigues of the Minister Bardas, the orthodox patriarch Ignatius had been deposed from his office by the Emperor Michael in December 857, and the Protospathar Photius, a man distinguished by his learning beyond the level of his contemporaries, was raised from the condition of layman directly to the Byzantine chair. A dispute between the followers of Ignatius and Photius broke forth in the East. The disputants appealed to Rome; the papal legates, Bishop Radoald of Portus (previously supporter of the rebellious Anastasius) and Zacharias of Anagni were bribed to acquiesce in the appointment of Photius. The Pope excommunicated these traitors to his will, and in the Roman Synod of April 863 pronounced the condemnation of Photius, and commanded him to resign the patriarchal chair. Legates went to and fro between Rome and Con-

[1] *Donec in praesentia Apostolica, vel missi ejus, aut Vestararii Ravennae legali ordine illas in judicio convincas* (n. 591).

[2] Pichler, *Gesch. der Kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident* (Munich, 1864, vol. i.).

stantinople, and since the time of the Iconoclastic strife Rome had not seen so many Greeks within her walls. The Imperial spathars, it is true, instead of costly copies of the Gospels, brought letters breathing hatred and contempt. The dispute assumed a dogmatic aspect as soon as Photius had formulated the articles which taunted the Latin Church with heresies. The charges reproached her with her fasts on the Sabbath; the celibacy of her priests, but above all with the *filioque*, the belief in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son—opinions and matters which happily fail to excite the intellect of modern days; but which, during centuries when mankind was destitute of problems more worthy of philosophy, served to inflame the reason and to create the division which has for ever kept the two Churches apart. Photius on his side excommunicated the Pope. But after the assassination of the Emperor Michael, he was himself deposed in 867 by Basil, the successor to the throne, and thus the bitter contest was maintained throughout the entire pontificate of Nicholas.

The Bulgarians and Nicholas I.

The quarrel with the East was still further stirred by Rome's relations with a barbarous people on the frontiers of the Byzantine Empire. At the time when Gregory the Great extended a fatherly hand over Britain, and gave the Anglo-Saxon Roman ecclesiastical law, the Greeks remained indifferent; but when Nicholas sought to bring the Bulgarians into the fold of the Roman Church, their jealousy was roused to the utmost pitch. The formidable Slav race had been settled for some centuries in the

rich province of Moesia, on the southern shore of the Danube. They had frequently fought for the possession of the frontier against the Frankish Counts in Pannonia, had advanced to the very walls of Constantinople, and penetrated far into the provinces beyond the Balkans. More than one Greek army had been defeated by their arrows. Since 811 the wild Bulgarian king, seated alone at table—his savage warriors grouped at a respectful distance around, or devouring their rough meal while lying on the ground—had used the skull of a Byzantine Emperor as a drinking-cup.[1] This was the skull set in gold of that Nicephorus who had dethroned Irene.[2] Christianity had made its way to these rude warriors from Byzantium through the means of two brothers, Constantine and Methodius of Thessalonica, the Apostles of the Slavs. King Boris, at the time at peace with the Emperor Lewis, had consented in 861 to be baptised according to the Greek rite by the name of Michael. By the help of the saints, or with the sabre and courage of a bold warrior, he had subdued the heathen party among his nobles, who had attempted his life. He now sent envoys to Rome. Doubts as to the manner in which the Bulgarians should be baptised, aroused apparently by the differences existing between the missionaries in his country, where Latin and Greek clergy worked in

[1] Responsa of Pope Nicholas to the Bulgarians.

[2] Nicephorus with his army was slain by Krum, King of the Bulgarians, on July 25, 811. A. Hilferding, *Gesch. der Serben und Bulgaren*, translated from the Russian by Schmaler, 1856, p. 29. On the conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity, see Jirecek, *Gesch. der Bulgaren*, p. 150 *f.* (Prague, 1876).

opposition, had found their way into the mind of the King, who had hitherto passed his life in happy heathen ignorance. The patriarchal chair of Byzantium was at the time the object of furious strife between two rivals; and Boris, who wished to keep aloof from Byzantine influence, turned to the Pope to obtain counsel and priests for his subjects.

The Bulgarian envoys, accompanied by the King's own son, came to Rome in August 866. Among the valuable presents which they brought, were the victorious weapons of the prince, borne by him in his wars with the heathen rebels. These he destined as a votive gift to S. Peter. The news of these offerings, however, excited against the Pope the wrath of the already irritated Emperor Lewis, now in Benevento. He demanded the surrender of the weapons and the remainder of the Bulgarian gifts. He may have considered these signs of conquest gifts unfitted for S. Peter, and have coveted them as warlike trophies of Bulgaria, a new province which he hoped to incorporate with the Empire. Nicholas surrendered some of the weapons, others he retained with apologies.[1] Meanwhile the Bulgarians were received in Rome with open arms. The Pope selected two bishops to teach in Bulgaria, Paul of Populonia, and Formosus of Portus, who was destined later to wear the papal crown. They left accompanied by an embassy bound

[1] *Lib. Pont.* n. 608. Andreas Presbyter, a contemporary, says that the King himself came to Rome and was baptised by the Pope, *et fide sancta confirmata recepit doctores ab eod. apostolico et in suam reversus est patriam.* (*Dom Bouquet*, vii. 105). The *Liber Pontificalis* would scarcely have been silent on this point. The King had already assumed the name of Michael from the Greek Emperor.

for Constantinople, which intended to pass through Bulgaria on its way. The nuncios arrived safely. The Legates bound for the Byzantine Court, however, were not permitted to cross the Bulgarian frontiers, but were instead forced to return home. Formosus and Paul meanwhile baptised uninterruptedly troops of Bulgarians. They drove out the Greek missionaries; they induced the king to receive only Latin clergy and only the Roman faith. A deputation even went to the Pope to request that the wary Formosus might be given them as Archbishop.[1] Nicholas declined to comply with the request, as he did not wish to deprive Portus of its shepherd; he sent, however, several presbyters to the distant province, and commanded the Bulgarians to choose one of these men as Archbishop.

He had already tranquillised the childish doubts of the Bulgarians, and his answers, collected under the title Responsa, form a species of code of civil constitutions for an uncivilised nation. There is scarcely a duty or contingency of civil life about which the simple Bulgarians did not desire instruction. They ask under what forms they may marry, at what time they may consummate a marriage: at what time of day they may eat, how they may dress, whether they may condemn criminals; and remind us in short of the savages of Paraguay and of the constitutions drawn up for them by the Jesuits. They inform the Pope that they had hitherto been accustomed to carry a horse's tail in the front of battle as a banner, and ask what they are to substitute in place of this symbol.

[1] *Vita Nicol. I.* n. 609.

The Pope replaced the horse's tail by the Cross. They tell him that previous to a battle they use all sorts of incantations to propitiate the gods in their favour; and the Pope advises them instead to pray in the churches, to open the prison doors and to liberate the slaves and prisoners of war. The king asks whether it is consistent with Christianity that he should dine alone, apart from the queen and soldiers; the Pope answers with an exhortation to humility and assures him that the famous kings of old had condescended to eat with their friends and slaves. On a question more political than practical, namely, which bishops were to be reverenced as true patriarchs, Nicholas takes the welcome opportunity to answer minutely, and in a voice sufficiently loud to be heard at Constantinople. The chief of all patriarchs, he replied, was the Pope in Rome, whose church had been founded by the Princes of the Apostles; the second place belonged to Alexandria, a foundation of S. Mark; Antioch was the third, since Peter had presided over Antioch before he had come to Rome. These three were, therefore, Apostolic Patriarchates. Constantinople and Jerusalem, on the other hand, could claim no such authority; the seat in Constantinople had been founded by no Apostle, and the Patriarch of the so-called New Rome was only named Pontifex by favour of the Emperor, and not through any inherent right.[1]

[1] *Quia CP. nova Roma dicta est favore principum potius, quam ratione, patriarcha ejus pontifex, appellatus est*, n. 92 of the *Responsa ad Consulta Bulgar.* Labbé, *Concil.* ix. 1534. The Pope forbids the application of torture, and expressly prohibits baptism by force.

These and similar articles are contained in the Bulgarian Constitutions of Nicholas I., one of the most memorable monuments of the practical activity and astuteness of the Roman Church, which in districts of the distant East, untraversed by any Latin since the days of Valens and Valentinian, suddenly and unaided by force of arms or by tribunals, thus established Roman laws and acquired a new province. The relations between Nicholas and King Boris, although of a widely different nature, redounded no less to the glory of Rome than the victories which Trajan had once achieved over King Decebalus in the same Danubian provinces. The spiritual territory did not, however, long remain in possession of Rome, but as early as the year 870 became united instead with the Greek Church.

3. Dispute concerning Waldrada—Nicholas condemns the Synod of Metz, and deposes Gunther of Cologne and Theutgaud of Treves—Lewis II. comes to Rome—Excesses of his Troops in the City—Defiance of the German Archbishops—Firmness and Victory of the Pope.

While Nicholas fought against the Greek schism, and anxiously watched the advance of the Mohammedans in Sicily and Southern Italy, he found himself drawn into such violent conflict with the royal house and with the Church of the Franks, that he began to dread a Frankish schism also. The fortunes of two women of illustrious birth were the cause of the quarrel. Public morality (if we may use the term

in this century) was outraged by scandalous if not unusual occurrences. Judith, the daughter of Charles the Bald, and the widow of Ethelwolf, had married her step-son Ethelbald, without the alliance being considered immoral. On her return to France after the death of her second husband, this voluptuous woman roused the passion of Count Baldwin. He seduced her, and King Charles in consequence had him excommunicated by a Synod. The lovers turned to the Pope, who effected a reconciliation with the king. At the same time another woman acquired an unenviable notoriety by the licentiousness of her life. Ingiltrude, daughter of Count Mactifried, married to Count Boso, had left her husband, and heedless of the papal anathemas, had led for years a dissolute life in company with her paramours. But the fate of these women was thrown into the shade by the misfortunes of a queen and the triumphant effrontery of a royal courtesan.

Dispute concerning Waldrada.

Lothar of Lotharingia, the brother of the Emperor, put away his wife Thiutberga for the sake of his mistress Waldrada. This tragedy set countries and peoples, Church and State in commotion, and afforded the Pope opportunity to rise to a height where he was encompassed by a more glorious renown than any which theological dogmas could lend him. The attitude adopted by Nicholas with regard to this royal scandal was firm and lofty. Priestly power appeared in him as a moral force to rescue virtue and to punish vice—a power necessary in a barbarous age when the public opinion which judges even princes had as yet no existence. The repudiated and

calumniated queen, whose crown Lothar had already placed on the head of his mistress, invoked the aid of the Pope. The Pope charged the Synod of Metz to pronounce sentence, and threatened the royal adulterer with excommunication if he failed to appear before the tribunal. The papal legates, among them Radoald of Portus, who had previously accepted bribes from Byzantium, proved accessible to the influence of gold, which has possessed irresistible attractions for the Romans of every age. They withheld the papal letters, and pronounced Lothar's marriage to have been legally dissolved, and Waldrada to be his lawful wife. For the sake of doing something, however, they sent the Archbishop Gunther of Cologne and Theutgaud of Treves to Rome, to lay the resolutions of the Synod before the Pope. Among the many bishops, covetous of royal immunities and donations, who unscrupulously supported the wishes of Lothar, these men were his most trusted advocates. They further held to the monarchy in order to strengthen the episcopate against the Pope. Arrived in Rome, they produced the acts of the Frankish Synod, hoping to win the Pope to their side by their powers of persuasion. Nicholas, however, kept them waiting three weeks, then ordered them to appear before the Synod in the Lateran, and without allowing them any defence, without judicial examination, or any intervention of the Frankish bishops, pronounced their deposition and excommunication. At the same time he annulled the decrees of the provincial synod of Metz.[1] These occurrences took place in the autumn of 863.

[1] This was the complaint of both the archbishops in their memorial:

The Archbishops forthwith hastened to the Emperor at Benevento. They complained of the violence with which they had been treated, and told him that both he and his brother Lothar had been insulted in their persons. They represented that the unchecked dominion of the Pope threatened the Imperial and royal majesty, and at the same time the Frankish Church, and thus roused the wrath of Lewis. He immediately departed for Rome with an army, accompanied by his wife Engelberga and by the two Archbishops, whom he intended to compel the Pope to reinstate in their dignities. In February 864 he entered the city.[1] Since, as report asserted, he came with hostile intentions, the Pope ordered general fasts and processions, and plunged the whole city into mourning. The Emperor made his dwelling in the palace beside S. Peter's. He received no welcome from the Pope, who shut himself up in the Lateran and ceaselessly assailed heaven with prayers against the "evil working prince." Lewis's barons in vain represented that he would only increase the anger of the Emperor by his conduct. The processions continued through the city. One of them on its way to S. Peter's was in the act of ascending the steps of the atrium when some of Lewis's vassals and soldiers, irritated by the Pope's continued refusal, attacked the clergy, maltreated

The Emperor Lewis comes to Rome, 864.

sine synodo et canonico examine, nullo accusante, nullo testificante—tuo solius arbitrio et tyrannico furore damnare nosmet voluisti. Hincmar, *Annal. A.* 864 (*Mon. Germ.* i.).

[1] I obtain this date from a diploma of Farfa: *dat. VII. Kal. Martii anno Christo propitio Imperii Domni Hludovici Piis Aug. XI.* (should be X. according to the era of Lewis of 855, when he became sole Emperor) *Ind. XII. actum Leonina Civitate* (Fatteschi, &c., n. lv.).

them, tore down the banners of the Church, and broke the Cross of S. Helena, in which, according to the belief of the time, a portion of the true cross was enclosed. The procession sought safety in flight.[1] A scene such as this had not been witnessed in Rome since the foundation of the Carolingian Empire. The harmony between Papacy and Empire seemed destroyed, and for the first time the national hatred between Germans and Romans found vent within the city. His soldiers attack a procession.

Rumour reported that the Pope had been secretly conveyed in a boat across the Tiber, had fled to S. Peter's, and had there spent two nights without food or drink; the Frank who had broken the Cross of S. Helena had died, and the Emperor himself had been attacked by fever. The Empress undertook to mediate between Nicholas and her husband.

On receiving an assurance of his safety, the Pope visited the Imperial quarters and had a long interview with Lewis. Nicholas returned to the Lateran. The archbishops, however, whom Lewis ordered to return to Germany, were not released from the ban. Before leaving Rome the German prelates drew up a document protesting against their deposition in such vehement language as never Pope had heard from bishops before. The effort of the national churches to obtain independence from Roman supremacy found therein its most powerful expression. In the Defiance of the Archbishops of Cologne and Treves.

[1] Hincmar, *A.* 864. Erchempert, c. 37. The *Libell. de Imp. Potes.* says that the Pope had stayed at S. Apostoli, and had invoked heaven against the princes. The scene, however, had made him more tractable; *pro qua causa apostolicus mitior effectus est* (p. 721). According to the same *libellus* the Emperor had even earlier than this appropriated Church property in Campania.

preface to their memorial, addressed to the bishops of Lotharingia, they ventured to say, "Although Nicholas, who is called Pope, who reckons himself an apostle to the Apostles and professes to be Imperator of the whole world, has wished to condemn us, he has found resistance in us with Christ's help and has repented not a little what he has done."[1] Their letter, which was addressed to the Pope, contained seven heads. After the authors had condemned the Pope's uncanonical dealing, they hurled back the anathema on his own head.[2] Gunther of Cologne, a man of great resolution, entrusted this document to his brother Hilduin, a priest, to give to the Pope in person; and in case the Pope refused to receive it, the letter was to be laid on the shrine of S. Peter. Nicholas, as was expected, refused, and Hilduin, surrounded by a body of armed men, defiantly entered S. Peter's to fulfil his brother's behests. The guards of the shrine (they formed a special Schola under the title *Mansionarii scholae confessionis S. Petri*) surrounded the Apostle's grave. The intruders struck one of them down lifeless, threw the document on the shrine, and forcing a way with their swords, rushed out of the basilica.

Discord between the Emperor and the Pope.

The incident shows that the Emperor was by no means reconciled to the Pope. Lewis tranquilly looked on while his soldiers, as if in an enemy's country, committed the grossest excesses. They

[1] *Annal. Hincmar, A.* 864.

[2] With reference to the point of law concerning the validity of Waldrada's marriage, they advanced the argument of the right of nature in opposition to the canonical command: *et quia suo viro parentum concensu, fide, affectu, ac dilectione conjugali sociata est, uxor profecto, non concubina habenda sit.*

plundered houses and even churches, were guilty both of murder and of outrages on nuns and married women. Lewis himself scorned to spend Easter in Rome. He left the city and purposely celebrated the festival in Ravenna with John, the resentful archbishop. John, mindful of the humiliation he had received, gladly seized on the opportunity afforded by the discord which prevailed between the German bishops and the Pope, to hold out the hand of fellowship to the condemned prelates and to fan the wrath of Lewis.[1] The storm, however, did not bend the vigour of the Pope. With the firmness of an ancient Roman this proud and unyielding spirit remained unmoved. He threatened excommunications, which were dreaded like actual thunderbolts. The bishops in Lotharingia sent contrite explanations. Arsenius, the papal legate, furnished with letters breathing menaces to the King, the bishops and counts, entered Lotharingia with an arrogance that resembled that of the pro-consuls of ancient Rome. With one hand Nicholas led the repudiated wife back to the king, trembling before the sentence of excommunication, with the other he removed the paramour. The kingdom, weak and disunited, threw up its weak case against Rome, and left a brilliant victory in the hands of the Papacy. Nevertheless the drama was not yet played out. Nicholas himself died, and it was only under his successor that the scandalous trial was brought to an end.[2]

Victory of the Pope.

[1] Our information on all these occurrences is due to Hincmar.

[2] Lothar again put away the unhappy queen and took back Waldrada, whereupon she was excommunicated by Nicholas in 866.

4. Nicholas's care for the City—He restores the Jovia and Trajana—He fortifies Ostia anew—His few Buildings and Votive Gifts—Condition of Learning—Lothar's Edict concerning Schools, 825—Decrees of Eugenius II. and Leo IV. regarding the Parochial Schools—Greek Monks in Rome—The Libraries—The Manuscripts—Coins.

Nothing is heard of any disturbances in Rome during the pontificate of Nicholas. On the contrary, abundant harvests and general prosperity are recorded. Poverty was liberally relieved, and like a Roman emperor the Pope had tickets for food marked with his name distributed among the indigent.[1]

Nicholas restores the Aqua Jovia and Trajana.

Nicholas restored two aqueducts; the so-called Tocia and the Trajana or Sabatina, known at the time in the Leonine city, which it supplied, as the Aqueduct of S. Peter.[2] Since Gregory IV. had previously restored the same aqueduct, it follows that it must either have been injured by the Saracens, or else that Nicholas improved both its course and

[1] *Vita Nicol.* n. 600. It was at this time customary to reckon by holy days. Sunday was *feria prima.* Empty nutshells strung together marked the days on which such tickets were available.

[2] *Formam aquae, quae vocatur Tocia* (n. 584). Variants, *Acia, Accia, Jocia.* Cassio (i. 372) holds the Tocia to be the Trajana Tuscia. The Aqua Tuscia is mentioned in a Council as early as the time of Constantine. *Ibid.* p. 369. Constant. Corvisieri, *Dell Acqua Tocia in Roma nel medio evo* (*Il Buonarotti*, vol. v. 1870) explains it to be the Appia. He points out that a brook Tuzia had existed in ancient times, and that there was a *fundus Aquae Tutiae* in the Ager Veranus in the time of Sylvester.

the distribution of its supplies.[1] Owing to the defective method of construction in vogue at this period buildings rapidly fell to decay. Nicholas found himself obliged to restore the walls of Ostia, rebuilt by Gregory IV. but a short time before, and to provide them with stronger towers, in which he placed a garrison. Ostia had previously been deserted from dread of the corsairs, while Portus owed its survival to the presence of its Corsican colony.[2]

The surprisingly small number of votive gifts and eccleiastical buildings due to Nicholas reflected no dishonour on the memory of the Pope. According to the statement of his biographer, he built the portico of S. Maria in Cosmedin; of which, since he thus singled out the church for special distinction, he had doubtless been cardinal. Besides a dwelling-house for the Popes he also here erected a beautiful triclinium. To Nicholas, moreover, were due the paintings or mosaics in the diaconate of S. Maria Nova of Leo IV. He also built a new dwelling-house in the Lateran palace and a convent beside S. Sebastian.

Had his biographer possessed any appreciation of culture, he would not have failed to inform us of the encouragement given to learning by the Pope. The

[1] According to the *Vita Gregor. IV.* n. 467, the Sabatina flowed *ad Ecclesiam b. Petri Ap., atque ad Janiculam sicut prius.* *Vita Nicol. I.* n. 607, on the contrary: *formam aquaeductus qui multis a temporibus ruerat, et ad b. Petrum Ap. ob hoc aqua non ducebatur, in meliorem, quam fuerat, certamine quam plurimo revocari statuit.* This *multis a temporibus* is therefore erroneous.

[2] *Vita Nicol. I.* n. 607: *Ostiensem urbem—in ruinis jacentem—fortiori, firmiorique fabrica raedificari—jussit—promptos ad bella in ea homines collocavit.*

chronicler extols the father of Nicholas as having been a friend to the liberal arts, and as having initiated his son in these studies, but the inference that on that account Nicholas must have been versed in every species of sacred discipline cannot be considered to apply to learning other than that of a theological nature.[1] The Carolingian period is graced by the honourable endeavour to subdue barbarism by the encouragement given to learning. Under the influence of Charles's genius and the culture of his friends, versed in the classic literature of the Romans, education received a sudden impetus, and the successors of the Emperors followed in his footsteps. A conspicuous proof of this statement is given by the edict of Lothar of the year 825. While the Emperor here laments that owing to the indolence of the authorities, instruction had almost ceased in every part of Italy, he orders the establishment of nine central schools for special districts; namely Pavia, the foundation of whose later celebrated university has been erroneously attributed to Charles the Great, Ivrea, Turin, Cremona, Florence, Fermo (for the duchy of Spoleto), Verona, Vicenza, and Forum Julii (Cividale of Friuli).[2] The significant

The School Edict of Lothar, 825.

[1] *Pater vero ejus liberalium cum fuisset amator artium, et nobilissimum polleret fomitem cunctis eum elementis, almificisque vitiis imbuens, literarum studiis, et optimis artibus perornabat, ita ut nulla sacrarum species remanerat disciplinarum.* Beginning of the *Vita Nicol. I.*

[2] The *Constitutio Lotharii* dated from Olonna in May 825, and not as Muratori and Tiraboschi think in 823. *Mon. Germ.* iii. 248. It begins: *de doctrina vero, quae ob nimiam incuriam atque ignaviam quorundam praepositorum, cunctis in locis est funditus extincta, placuit, . . . vid. ut ab his qui nostra dispositione ad docendos alios per loca*

remark concerning the extinction of schools testifies to the deplorable condition of education throughout Italy. Any higher institutions for learning are altogether out of the question, and the word *doctrina* only included religious matters, or at the utmost the elements of profane knowledge,—that is to say, grammar.

Decay of Learning in Rome.

The edict of Lothar had reference to the kingdom of Italy alone, and affected neither Rome nor the provinces of the Church. Here, however, there prevailed the same, perhaps an even greater degree of ignorance, as some of the Roman decrees of Council would seem to show. In 826 Eugenius II. issued the mandate that professors should be appointed in every bishopric and parish diligently to teach the sciences and the sacred dogmas. This distinction proves that consideration was shown for secular learning (*artes liberales*) in express distinction from theology (*sancta dogmata*). Scarely any teachers, however, were forthcoming. All forms of profane training disappeared, and when Leo IV. in 853 confirmed the decree of Eugenius, he added in so many words: "although teachers of the liberal sciences are, as usual, seldom to be found in the parishes, yet masters of Holy Writ and instruction in the ecclesiastical offices should not be wanting."[1]

denominata sunt constituti, maximum detur studium, qualiter sibi commissi scholastici proficiant. We may note the term *scholasticus* for pupil.

[1] Decree of Eugenius in the *Concil. Roman.* 826, canon. 34: *Magistri et doctores constituantur, qui studia Literarum, liberaliumque artium, ac sancta habentes dogmata assidue doceant*; and Leo IV.'s addition: *etsi liberalium artium praeceptores in plebibus* (now *le pievi*)

The same lament might also have been raised in Rome. No master, no school of any note, is mentioned here. True, after the Benedictines had settled in the city, schools had been established in the monasteries; and the ancient school in the Lateran, which owed its origin to the Benedictine order, and where several Popes had been educated, still survived. These institutions could not, however, compare with the schools of Germany or France, such as those of Fulda, S. Gall, Tours, Corvei, or the school of Pavia in Lombardy. No distinguished men such as John Scotus, Rhabanus Maurus, Agobard of Lyons, such as the Scotch Dungalus in Pavia, or Lupus of Ferrières, dwelt in Rome. Law among profane sciences alone might still receive some encouragement, and in consequence of Lothar's statute some teachers of law, who understood the code of Justinian and taught it from compendia, must have been forthcoming, while at the same time advocates and notaries could scarcely have been ignorant of Salic and Lombard law.

Several Popes had established Greek monks in new convents. These monks gave instruction to the Roman clergy in the Greek language, and if the culture of Hellenic literature did not thereby profit, the knowledge of Greek was at least kept alive in Rome, and men who afterwards became of service as nuncios in Constantinople, as writers and as interpreters, were trained in these seminaries at the instance of the Popes.

ut assolet, raro inveniuntur, tamen divinae scripturae magistri, et institutores ecclesiastici officii nullatenus desuit.

Some churches and convents were provided with libraries. The Lateran Library still remained, and the honourable title of "Bibliothecarius" survived even in times of utter darkness. The papal archives contained the innumerable acts of the Church and the regesta or letters of the Popes, priceless documents of history and of the Latin of the time, the true Roman literature, as we may call it, of the earlier half of the Middle Ages. These treasures which disappeared without a trace in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, have left a void which cannot too deeply be deplored.[1] The Libraries.

We can scarcely doubt that works of Latin and Greek literature still remained in the libraries of churches and convents. Such manuscripts must have been preserved here and there in Rome, from the Gothic period. Copies must also have been made in the course of time. In the ninth century the monasteries of other countries possessed many literary treasures. In 831 the Abbey of Centulae or S. Riquier in France, where Angilbert had been abbot, boasted the possession of two hundred and fifty-six Codices, and it is instructive to mark the books classed by the chroniclers as profane writings: Aethicus *de mundi descriptione*, the *Historia Homeri*, including Dictys and Dares Phrygius, the whole of

[1] Did we but possess these regesta as we do the happily preserved letters of Gregory I., the treasure of the sixth century, the history of Rome from the seventh to the tenth century would live anew. The secret archives of the Vatican only contain the regesta from the time of Innocent III., which occupy more than 2000 volumes. The fact that he has made these treasures of learning accessible to the student will ever redound to the honour of Leo XIII.

Josephus, Pliny the younger, Philo, the Fables of Avienus, Virgil, and, among the "grammarians" which were especially in request at the time, Cicero, Donatus, Priscian, Longinus, and Prosper.[1] If books such as these were forthcoming in France, is it not probable that they were also found in Rome? In 855 the Abbot Lupus de Ferrières requested Benedict III. to send him manuscripts of Cicero de Oratore, the Institutions of Quintilian, the commentary of Donatus on Terence, and assured the Pope that after he had had them copied he would not fail to return the original manuscript.[2] In Roman accounts alone profane manuscripts remain unnoticed. When books are mentioned in the biographies of the Popes, gospels, antiphonaries, missals, with which it was customary to endow churches, are alone to be understood. Works such as these were justly esteemed precious, and find mention in epitaphs.

The Codices.

The expense of a parchment manuscript was great, and the labour expended in its writing and illustration far exceeded that bestowed by goldsmiths or metal workers on their lamps and vases.[3] Monks

[1] *Chronicum Centulense* in d'Achéry, *Spicileg.* ii. c. 3. Guinguené (*Hist. littér.* c. 72) might have learnt from this that the view of Andrès: *il n'y avait pas dans toute la France un Térence, un Cicéron, un Quintilien*, is erroneous).

[2] In spite of the dearth of books at this time, people were more liberal in Rome than in the present day. Manuscripts were lent to foreign countries. *Quae auctor. opera si vestra liberalitas nobis largita fuerit: deo annuente, una cum memorato S. Hieronymi Codice fideliter omnino restituenda curabimus.* Lupi Ferr. Ep. 103 (Duchesne, ii. 770).

[3] The MSS. are works of art. Who could look at the *Cod. Amiatinus* of the Vulgate, the ornament of the Laurentian Library, without

skilled in art spent their solitary lives over the transcription of these manuscripts of Holy Writ, or of the Fathers of the Church. They drew rather than wrote with brush and pen, sometimes in Roman uncials, in capitals or small letters, sometimes in the more difficult Lombard characters, and occasionally relieved their work with pictures in miniature. Of these illustrations, the first as a rule represents the writer or the abbot who employed him, one or other, or both of whom perhaps, held the parchment and presented it to a saint.[1] The difficulty of the characters offered a great obstacle to the writer, and forced him to draw.[2] He therefore illustrated his manuscripts

admiration? Bandini (*Dissert. I. Suppl. ad Catal.* 701) believes that it was sent as a present to the Monastery of Amiata in the time of Lewis I.; his suggestion, however, that it had belonged to Gregory I. is incapable of proof. The Popes bestowed MSS. on the churches, and the catalogues enumerate them alongside of candlesticks and ciboria. The epitaph of the Archdeacon Pacificus of Verona of the year 846 says in his praise: *Bis centenos terque senos codices fecerat* (Murat. *Diss.* xliii.). The inscription of the Presbyter George of S. Clemente in Rome says that he endowed this church (in 743) with manuscripts as with the widow's mite:

Veteris novique Testamentorum denique libros
Octateuchum, Regum, Psalterium, ac Prophetarium,
Salomonem, Esdram, Storiarum Ilico Plenos. (*Ibid.*)

[1] The celebrated Codex of Farfa in the Vatican contains such a frontispiece. But the most remarkable of the kind is the Lombard Cod. n. 353, saec. x., which I saw at Monte Casino. The title-page represents the Abbot John offering the Codex to S. Benedict. The picture is instructive with reference to the rich costume worn in old times by the Benedictines.

[2] The Lombard writing of saec. ix. x. and xi. is difficult on account of the letters *a* and *t*, which are easily confused; on account of *r* and *s*, and of the running together of *n* and *m*; otherwise it is invariable in character. The Diplomas are hieroglyphical. Of this

with artistic initials in gold and colours. Of the devoted industry of the age and its chaste art, so fertile in arabesque devices, we still possess an example in the celebrated Carolingian Codex of the Bible, which belongs to the ninth century and is preserved in the monastery of S. Paul as its greatest treasure.[1]

These manuscripts at the same time illustrate the character of the age, when art struggled with a deep-rooted barbarism, and bore in its own hard and awkward character traces of the conflict. The spirit of the ninth and following centuries, like that of the ancient Dorians, Egyptians and Etruscans, has in it something mysterious, enigmatic and symbolic, which is clearly expressed in portraiture and writing, in the use of monograms on documents and coins, and in the employment of arabesques. The coins more especially clearly bear the impress of the public life of this period, and the papal coins of the time display terrible types both in lettering and portraiture.[2]

fact the reader may convince himself from Mabillon (*de Re Dipl.*)—*e.g.* in the Diploma of Nicholas I. (p. 441), or the Bull of Paschalis I. to Patronax of Ravenna, Bulls of Benedict III., and of other Popes of saec. ix.

[1] This work was carried off to Paris, but was brought back again to Rome. It was probably a gift of the Carolingians. Whether the first miniature represented Charles the Great or Charles the Bald is uncertain. The drawing of the miniature is rude ; the initials, however, are very artistic.

[2] Coins of Leo III. have on the obverse S. PETRUS ; LEO PA in the centre ; on the reverse CARLVS, with IPA (Imperator) in the centre. The coin attributed to Stephen IV. is doubtful. Denarii of Paschalis have LVDOVVICVS IMP, in the middle ROMA, on the other side SCS PETRVS, in the centre the monogram PSCAL.

5. IGNORANCE IN ROME—THE *LIBER PONTIFICALIS* OF ANASTASIUS—ITS ORIGIN AND CHARACTER—TRANSLATIONS OF ANASTASIUS FROM THE GREEK—LIFE OF GREGORY THE GREAT BY JOHANNES DIACONUS.

Had the Anonymus of Salerno visited Rome in the time of Nicholas I., he would have failed to discover a band of thirty-two philosophers such as he had enumerated in the year 870 in the prosperous town of Benevento.[1] Had Echempert, who continued the history of the Lombards begun by Paulus Diaconus, arrived from his learned monastery, Monte Casino (where the illustrious Bertarius now reigned as abbot), the ignorance of the monks and cardinals in Rome would have struck him with dismay. Had Photius the Greek Patriarch, excommunicated by Nicholas I., appeared, the extent of his learning would have seemed miraculous in a city where scarcely a scholar was now able to distinguish by name the statues of poets and sages, which, black and mutilated, still remained in the ruinous Forum of Trajan.

Ignorance of the Roman Clergy.

The city of Cicero was put to shame not by the scientific learning of the Byzantines alone. The same

Likewise with succeeding Popes; the Imperial name is never absent. LEO IV.: obverse, LEO PAPA in monogram, around, SCS PETRVS; reverse: HLOTHARIVS, in the centre IMP. Domenico Promis.: *Monete dei Romani Pontefici avanti il mille* (Torino, 1858). He supplements and corrects Vignoli and Cinagli.

[1] *XXXII. Philosophos illo tempore Beneventum habuisse perhibetur, ex quibus illorum unus insignis Ildericus nomine. An. Salern.* c. 133. What sort of philosophers they were is shown by the fact that in a production attributed to Hilderich the author has recourse to the Madonna.

Arabs who had plundered the treasures of S. Peter's and S. Paul's could boast their universities and philosophers, their theologians and grammarians, astronomers and mathematicians, who adorned Kairowan, Seville, Alexandria, Bassora, and Bagdad, the Mohammedan Athens of the East. Constantinople, the great metropolis of theologians and sophists, of grammarians and learned pedants, found in the Caesar Bardas who had overthrown the Patriarch Ignatius a powerful Maecenas; in their princes, such as Leo Philosophus, and later his son Constantine Porphyrogenetus, zealous scholars; and in Photius a new Pliny or Aristotle of barbarian times, who deposited but a small portion of his erudition (extracts from 280 authors), in his famous "Bibliotheca."

Conscious of the possession of the purity (relatively speaking) of the Greek language, which their intellectual life retained for centuries to come, the Byzantines regarded Rome with contempt. The Emperor Michael, in a letter to Pope Nicholas I., derided the Romans on account of their Latin, which he termed a language of "barbarians and Scythians," and which as spoken at that time by the populace, and written by the notaries and even by the chroniclers, gave the learned Greeks sufficient grounds for scorn. The Pope answered in good Latin, and whether the answer was written by himself alone, or was the joint production of himself and his Chancery, still versed in style, the letter constituted by far the best kind of defence. The Pope might well have retorted that it was absurd for Michael to claim the title of Emperor of the Romans, a people whose language he

could not speak, and consequently termed barbarous; but the arguments employed by the Pope in defence of the tongue of Caesar, Cicero, and Virgil, are merely those derived from the Christian religion and the Cross, the title of which, J.N.R.J., was in Latin.[1]

Culture in Germany.

Even the races of Germany and Gaul, reproached by the Romans as barbarians, were in advance of the Latins in their attainments both in language and learning. A Hincmar of Rheims was a prodigy in the eyes of the Roman cardinals. The voice of poetry, both secular and religious, was dumb. But at the time when the Romans scarcely mustered sufficient talent to string together a few couplets for the mosaics in their churches, for the gates of their city, or the graves of their dead, Frankish chroniclers such as Ermold Nigellus wrote their histories in Latin verse, and German poets of heathen parentage indited in their vigorous mother-tongue Gospel harmonies, the originality of which still awakens our admiration. No theological work was any longer compiled in Rome. The history of the city, its remarkable transformation since the days of Pipin and Charles, found not a single annalist, and while Germany and France, and even Southern Italy (where the honoured monastery of Monte Casino still encouraged the writing of history) produced numer-

[1] *Ut linguae Latinae injuriam irrogaretis, hanc in epistola vestra barbaram et Scythicam appellantes.*—Ep. Nicol. I. in Labbé, ix. 1320. God had created the Latin language *ut cum Hebraea, atqua Graeca in titulo domini a reliquis discreta insignem principatum tenens omnibus nationibus praedicet Jesum Nazarenum regem Judaeorum*; nevertheless there was always the consciousness that the Latin tongue had become the universal language of Christendom.

ous chronicles, the indolence of Roman monks allowed the events of their city to remain shrouded in profound obscurity.

Precisely at this period, however, the Papacy energetically continued its ancient chronicles. Since the development of the ecclesiastical State, since the growth of the power not only of the Popes but also of the bishops (whose dioceses had become wealthy immunities), the necessity of leaving to posterity a history of the churches—in the form of a chronological series of their spiritual heads and of their biographies—had made itself the more conspicuously felt. The want was not an isolated one, for the same period produced several collections of the same kind, all based on the lists of the bishops, their letters or regesta and other deeds. Outside Rome Agnellus collected and wrote the barbarous but valuable history of the Archbishops of Ravenna, and the Neapolitan Deacon John compiled the biographies of the bishops of his native city. It is believed also that at this period the materials of the *Liber Pontificalis* were collected and edited, and that by Anastasius; for with his name is generally (although without justification) associated the Book of the Popes.[1]

The *Liber Pontificalis.*

This Anastasius, who bore the title of "Bibliothecarius," lived under Nicholas I. and John VIII. It is uncertain whether only the biographies of the Popes of his own time were the product of his pen. Biographies of the Popes in the form of calendars and of catalogues, which recorded the years

[1] This was first asserted by Panvinius, as the Abbé Duchesne has shown (*Étude sur le liber Pontificalis*, p. 2).

of the reigns and the transactions of each Pope, had been compiled from the second and third centuries.[1] After the time of Gregory the Great their letters and deeds were also largely drawn upon. And out of such material, which with the course of time became increasingly complete, these official papal biographies arose, and reached their greatest fulness during the Carolingian period. Destitute of the character of annals (a fact which adds to the difficulty of their use), they simply form a clumsy medley of very exact notices of buildings, votive gifts and really historic events. Their style is bad and far removed from the language of the Roman Chancery, whose dexterity, precision and power, as shown in the regesta of Nicholas I. and John VIII., fortunately preserved to us, still arouse our admiration. Derived, however, as these biographies are from the most trustworthy sources, their value is inestimable; and even the many intentional distortions of facts in favour of the Papacy fail to impair their value. Apart from these the history of the Papacy, as of the city for long centuries, would have been hid in darkness. But as with the biography of Nicholas I., the *Liber Pontificalis* ceased during a long period to be continued in its traditional form, we shall soon be obliged to lament the drying up of this source for the history of the city.[2]

[1] The oldest registers of the Roman bishops are the Greek ones of Hegesippos and Irenaeus (saec. ii.); then follow those of Eusebius in the Chronicle and history of the Church; afterwards the Latin Catalogues in Augustine and Optatus, the *Catalogus Liberianus* or that of Philocalus (354), and the Felicianus (530). *Chronologie der röm. Bischöfe bis zur Mitte des 4 Jahrhunderts*, by R. A. Lipsuis, Kiel, 1869.

[2] The *Vitae* Adrian II. and Stephen VI., which were added to the

The librarian Anastasius was, moreover, possessed of a knowledge of Greek. He translated the Chronography of Nicephorus, George Syncellus, Theophanes, and other works of Greek ecclesiastical literature. His fellow-citizen the Deacon John also understood Greek, and wrote the life of Gregory the Great with the help of the materials furnished by the Lateran archives. The production of such a monograph in the Carolingian period and after the author had survived the pontificate of Nicholas I., a Pope who in greatness and activity recalled Gregory, deserves attention. The work is an independent one, and of a character strikingly different from the barren biographies of other Popes. It shows the author to have been a man of versatile imagination, who strove, certainly unsuccessfully, after elegance and ease, and who possessed some knowledge of ancient literature.[1]

others, are attributed to a Bibliothecarius Guillelmus. See Pertz on the sources of the History of the Popes in the *Archiv der Gesellsch. für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, v. 68. Giesebrecht on the origin of the *Lib. Pont.* and its continuation in the *Allg. Monatsschr. für Wiss. und Lit.* April 1852. The latest researches are those of the Abbé L. Duchesne, *Étude sur le Lib. Pont.*, Paris, 1877, and Introduction to his edition of the work, Paris, 1884. According to his view the *Lib. Pont.* (the first redaction of which ends with Felix IV.) was compiled during the Gothic period by a contemporary of Anastasius II. and Symmachus, (died 514). Edited under Hormisdas (514–523), continued until Felix IV. (526 to 530), then carried on further. Editions of the *Lib. Pont.*: by the Jesuit Busaeus, *Ed. Princeps*, Moguntiae, 1602; by C. A. Fabroti, Paris, 1647; by Francesco Bianchini, Rome, 1718; by Muratori, 1723 (*Script.* iii. p. 1); by J. Vignoli, Rome, 1724; by L. Duchesne, Paris, begun in 1884.

[1] Tiraboschi is very cursory with regard to this period, a fault for which we cannot blame him; not to speak of Guinguené and Sismondi. Muratori's Dissert. xliii. deserves great praise.

CHAPTER V.

1. Rise of Papal Supremacy — The Ecclesiastical State—The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals—Death of Nicholas I., 867 — Adrian II. — Lambert of Spoleto attacks Rome — The Enemies of Adrian in Rome — Outrages of Eleutherius and Anastasius, and their Punishment.

The personal weakness of Charles's successors, their despicable passions, their quarrels with regard to the monarchy, which was irrevocably disorganised by feudalism, had at this time greatly increased the authority of the Pope. Nicholas I. united the sacred dignity with an intrepid spirit such as but few Popes have possessed. Distinguished birth, physical beauty, education, as good as the times permitted, were combined in him ; and since Gregory the Great no Pope had been favoured to such a degree by the good fortune which power attracts to itself. He succeeded in humiliating the royal as well as the episcopal power, and the enfeebled Empire sank under Lewis, who had no male heir, and who, so to speak, buried it in a series of energetic but petty and endless wars in Southern Italy, into a more and more empty name. Meanwhile, however, in the Papacy there arose the idea of universal spiritual monarchy,

which was later erected by Gregory VII. and perfected by Innocent III. The conception of Rome as the moral centre of the world still lingered in imperishable tradition. The more the Empire lost unity and power, and the less competent it became to form the political centre of the Christian commonwealth, the easier was it for the Papacy to advance the claim which it put forth, that of being the soul and principle of the Christian Republic, while the secular rulers now sank into mere changeable instruments.

From stress of circumstances, as also from a great historic impulse, the Papacy had restored the Roman Imperial power, and scarcely was the Empire created when the secret struggle of the spiritual against the political system began. Had the Roman Emperor been able to govern as a Christian monarch like Constantine and Theodosius, had all autonomy in the provinces been suppressed, the Pope might then have divided the dominion with the Emperor, and, resigning to him the troublesome task of temporal government, have retained the spiritual supremacy. But within the monarchy of Charles the motive power of human nature had called into being a multitude of separate forces, all alike inimical to Papacy and Empire: nationalities, provincial churches, national dukes, national bishops, kings, rights and liberties, privileges and immunities of every kind,—forces of natural disintegration and of German individuality which declared war to the systems. They weakened the Empire, the unity of which was only mechanical and its basis of a material and changeable nature.

The indivisible moral principle of the Papacy, however, enabled it, in spite of passing defeats, to subdue these hostile forces. Neither interrupted by time nor affected internally by political revolutions, it always conquered its opponents—royalty, episcopacy or the Empire. The faith of mankind itself, the one irresistible power on earth, accepted it as the supernatural source of these institutions and as the immovable axis of the spiritual world.

Nicholas I., founder of the Papal Monarchy.

In Nicholas the consciousness of the monarchy of Rome found its personal expression. Although it may be asserted that the possession of the state of the Church and of the city, which had been confirmed by the Empire, was not essential for spiritual supremacy, it must be admitted that it strongly furthered the views of the Papacy and invested them with an invaluable independence on an invaluable spot. The possession of a great kingdom in any other part of the world would never have given the Papacy the foundation it possessed in the little territory which had Rome for its capital. In the time of Nicholas I. the patrimonies of S. Peter were still the undisturbed property of the Church, whose treasury was filled with wealth incalculable. Nicholas's predecessors had founded cities, had equipped armies and fleets, had formed an Italian league, had defended and saved Rome, and Nicholas himself ruled as king over the beautiful country which stretched from Ravenna to Terracina. It is said that Nicholas was the first among the Popes to be crowned with the tiara, which the unbounded arrogance of his successors afterwards surrounded with a triple

crown.[1] To the monarchic spirit of such a man the crown was nothing foreign, but Nicholas saw in it more than the symbol of the temporal state which the Church acquired and soon lost. The spurious Donation of Constantine rendered good service to the claims of the Popes, and the extent given to these claims by this audacious forgery shows at the same time how far-reaching were the aims of the Papacy. More important, however, were the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which incorporated in themselves that Donation of territory. These memorable fabrications of several letters and decrees of bygone Popes, interspersed in a collection of Acts of Councils, and foisted upon the celebrated Isidore of Seville, date from the middle of the ninth century. Nicholas was the first among the Popes to make use of them as a code of papal rights.[2] They furnished the Church with privileges such as made it entirely independent of the State; they placed the royal power far below the papal, below even the episcopal. At the same time, however, they

The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.

[1] Novaes, Pagi and others assert this, supporting themselves on the *coronatur denique* of the *Lib. Pont.* The likeness of Nicholas I. is not displayed on his coins. Sergius III. (904) is still represented on a coin with a mitre. The tiara, of entirely oriental form, and surrounded with a diadem, was also called *Regnum* or *Phrygium*; Innocent III. consequently said: *in signum spiritualium contulit Mitram, in signum temporalium dedit mihi Coronam, Mitram quoque pro sacerdotio, Coronam pro Regno.* The Popes, wrote Innocent, seldom wore the tiara, almost always the mitre. Vignoli, *Antiq. Pontif. Rom. Denarii*, p. 63, and Novaes' Introd. ii. Diss. v. None of the ancient Papal crowns have been preserved; the earliest dates from Julius II.

[2] The Decretals were unknown to the Popes previous to the year 864. They were compiled by a cleric in France about 851 or 852. Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et capitula Angilramni*, Leipzig, 1863 (Introduction).

exalted the Pope high above the episcopate as inaccessible to the decrees of the provincial synods, and represented him as the supreme judge of metropolitans and bishops whose office and power, removed from royal influence, should be subject to the papal command. In a word, they ascribed to the Pope dictatorship in the ecclesiastical world. In these Decretals Nicholas I. recognised the most serviceable weapons for the struggle against kings and provincial synods. Over both powers he triumphed; while the Emperor, who foresaw the danger which threatened the political principle, was forced to play merely the part of spectator at the papal victory.

The death of this great Pope (November 13, 867) created a profound impression. The world testified to the fear and admiration in which it had held him[1]; those, however, who had been struck or threatened by his thunderbolts, cheerfully raised their heads, hoping for freedom and the abrogation of the papal decrees.

Adrian II., Pope, 867–872.

The choice of the Romans fell upon Adrian, the aged Cardinal of S. Marcus, the son of Talarus, and a member of the same family as Stephen IV. and Sergius II. The envoys of the Emperor present in Rome, offended because they had not been

[1] Anastasius announced the death to the Archbishop Ado of Vienne (Labbé, *Concil.* ix. 1587): *Eheu! quam sero talem virum ecclesia meruit, quam cito reliquit.* Regino says, *ad A.* 868: *post. b. Gregorium usque in praesens nullus praesul in Romana urbe—illi videtur aequiparandus. Regibus ac tyrannis imperavit, eisque ac si dominus orbis terrarum auctoritate praefuit.* Baronius, *Ann. A.* 867, gives his epitaph.

summoned to the election, were appeased by the explanation that the Romans had not infringed upon the rights of the crown, since although the constitution undoubtedly prescribed the Imperial ratification of the elected candidate, it nowhere ordained that the election should take place under the eyes of the Legates.[1] They were tranquillised with this assurance; the Emperor himself ratified the election, and Adrian II. was consecrated Pope on December 14.

He celebrated his accession to the pontificate by an amnesty. He admitted some of the clergy excommunicated by his predecessor to his first mass, among them the notorious Cardinal Anastasius and also Theutgaud of Treves. He pardoned this repentant offender, and allotted him as dwelling a cell in the Monastery of S. Andrew on the Clivus Scauri.[2] Some of the prelates accused of high treason languished in exile. The Emperor had also sent the Bishops of Nepi and Velletri into banishment, an action which shows the completeness of his imperatorial power. Adrian begged for their restoration. Other Romans, laymen, had been sent to the galleys as guilty of high

[1] According to a decree, attributed to Stephen IV., the election of a Pope must be carried out by the assembled clergy, and the elected candidate consecrated in presence of the Imperial plenipotentiary. This decree was renewed by Nicholas I. at a synod in 862 or 863, Niehues, "Die Wahldecrete Stephan's III. and IV." (*Histor. Jahrb. der Görres-Gesellschaft*, 1880, p. 141–153.

[2] *Vita Hadr. II.* n. 616. S. Gregory appeared to Teutgaud in a dream and commanded him to leave his convent. He escaped to the Sabina, where he died. Joh. Diacon. *Vita S. Gregor IV.* c. 94. Neither did Gunther, who had been stricken by Nicholas I.'s thunderbolt, recover, although Adrian admitted him to the Communion in 869 (Hincmar's *Annal.*).

treason: the Pope obtained their release. It appears that during the vacancy of the sacred chair many had fallen victims to accusations, false or otherwise, made to the Imperial envoys. The interregnum at that time had already produced a state of anarchy, and favoured the tyranny of the powerful,[1] of which a most extraordinary occurrence affords an illustration. Shortly before Adrian's consecration, Lambert, Duke of Spoleto, had attacked the city. In league with the disaffected in Rome, where dwelt many influential Lombards and Franks, some of them even bearing the ducal title, and perhaps still unaware of the ratification of the election, Lambert ventured on a measure which far out-stepped the limits of his authority. This authority invested the Dukes of Spoleto, in accordance with the Constitution of the Empire, with the right, on the death of the Pope, of superintending the election of a successor; and generally speaking the Duke of Spoleto appears at this time as Viceroy in Roman affairs.[2] Entering the undefended city, Lambert assumed the demeanour of a conqueror. He confiscated property belonging to the nobility and sold it or presented it to the Franks;

Lambert of Spoleto attacks Rome.

[1] *Benedictionem summi Pontif. ad consolationem vid. multorum qui factiosorum tyrannide liberius solito saeviente inter unius decessionem et alterius substitutionem Pontificis diversis agitantur exiliis*, &c. *Vita Hadr. II.* n. 615. Concerning the exiled bishops: n. 617.

[2] *Divisis quippe Italiae finibus, Spoletanorum dux Romae constitutus est vice Regis, tali pacto, ut quando Apostolicus obiret, interesset Dux praefatus electioni futuri Pontificis, accipiens plurima dona in partem Regiam. Eutropii Presbyteri Langobardi Tractatus de jurib. et privilegiis Imperatorum in Imperio Romano* (composed about 900) in Goldast, *Monarchia* i. 9.

he sacked churches and convents, and permitted his soldiers to ravish Roman maidens both in the city and neighbourhood. He then retired. The Pope wrote letters of complaint to the German Emperor, and excommunicated all Franks and Lombards who had summoned Lambert or had taken part in the sack. This incident reveals the approaching dissolution of the Carolingian Empire. It ushers in the period of utter confusion in Italy, of the disputes of the dukes with regard to Rome, and of the war of factions in the city itself, which we shall soon have to describe.[1]

Lewis was in Southern Italy. He had issued a general summons to his Italian vassals to rise and attack the Saracens at Bari, and was on the point of beginning the campaign from Lucania.[2] Here the complaints of the Romans reached him; he lacked the time, however, and perhaps the desire to punish Lambert by depriving him of the Duchy, which he only did, and on quite other grounds, in 871.

Adrian II. was severely tried in the early years of

[1] *Vita Hadr. II.* n. 622. *Igitur Lambertus—tempore consecrationis—Romanam urbem, praeter consuetudinem, sicut tyrannus intravit, non rebellantem, sicut victor satellitibus suis ad praedandum distribuit.* The *Vita* mentions as partisans of Lambert in Rome: Aistaldus, Walterius, Hilpianus, Odo and Theopert, all Germans and probably ancestors of the later Astalli, Gaulterii, Ilperini, Oddoni, Tiberti.

[2] The *Constitutio promotionis exercitus observationis partibus Beneventi* is to be found in the *Historiola Ignoti Casin.* in Camil. Peregrin. *A.* 866. The Tuscans were to march *cum populo qui de ultra veniunt* through Rome to Ponte Corvo. This Lombard fortress had arisen about this time in the neighbourhood of Aquino. I have made use of the *Cod. Diplom. Pontis Curvi* in Monte Casino, which covers the interval between 953 and 1612.

his pontificate by some terrible experiences. His enemies, adherents of the late Pope, grudged him the tiara, and spread the report that from fear of public opinion he wished to annul the acts of his predecessor by which the papal power had risen to such a height. Adrian hastened to silence these reports; he tranquillised the Roman patriots by the assurance that he had never forsaken the path of Nicholas I., and won their favour by ordering a public prayer for the late Pope and by the solemn recognition of his decrees. Adrian further commanded the completion of the basilica which Nicholas had begun. While he thus pacified the friends of his predecessor, he irritated his enemies, who consequently gave him the ambiguous name of Nicolaite.[1]

Outrage committed by the brothers Anastasius and Eleutherius.

Of this party, which was supported by the Franks, Cardinal Anastasius and his brother Eleutherius were prominent members. They belonged to the highest ranks of the nobility, and were sons of the wealthy Bishop Arsenius, who could not brook the fact that his son had been excommunicated by Leo IV. and his hopes of the tiara ruined by Nicholas I. Adrian had a daughter born in lawful wedlock before he had entered holy orders. On his elevation to the Papacy he betrothed the maiden to a noble Roman. Eleutherius, however, impelled either by love or by hatred, carried off the bride-elect and married her. The outraged Pope, impotent to punish a powerful man who held himself intrenched within the walls of a strong palace, sent urgent letters to the Emperor begging him to dispatch envoys to judge

[1] *Vita*, n. 618.

the criminal. At the same time the father of Eleutherius hastened to Benevento to win over the avaricious Empress by gifts, but was there overtaken by death. The Imperial Missi came to Rome, Eleutherius, in a transport of rage, stabbed the daughter of the Pope and her mother Stephania, who willingly or otherwise had accompanied her child. The Imperialists, however, seized the murderer and beheaded him.

Moved by these events, the unfortunate Adrian summoned a synod. He renewed the excommunication against Anastasius, to whom, justly or unjustly, a share in his brother's crimes was attributed, threatening him with the anathema if he withdrew more than forty miles from the city or usurped any ecclesiastical function. The Cardinal received the sentence on October 12, 868, in the basilica of S. Prassede, and swore to submit to it.[1] These events showed the height to which the defiance of the Roman nobility had attained. At the time still controlled by Imperial authority, as soon as this authority was extinguished in the city, it was to assume the control of the papal chair.

[1] Hincmar, *Annal.* 868. The mildness of the sentence deserves praise. Excommunication nevertheless was a terrible punishment, excluding the offender from human society: *et qui cum eo in locutione cibo vel potu communicaverit, pari excommunicatione cum eo teneatur annexus.*

2. RENEWED CONTROVERSY REGARDING WALDRADA—LOTHAR'S PERJURY—HIS HUMILIATING RECEPTION IN ROME—HIS SUDDEN DEATH—LEWIS IN LOWER ITALY—CONCEPTION OF THE IMPERIUM AT THIS TIME—LEWIS'S LETTER TO THE EMPEROR OF BYZANTIUM—THE EMPIRE DISGRACED BY THE SURPRISE IN BENEVENTO—LEWIS COMES TO ROME—IS CROWNED AGAIN—THE ROMANS PROCLAIM ADALGISUS OF BENEVENTO ENEMY TO THE REPUBLIC.

The work which Nicholas had begun was continued by Adrian in the same spirit. The history of the Church extols the firmness of the new Pope in opposition to the bishops. But we cannot dwell even briefly on the celebrated Eighth Œcumenical Council held at Byzantium in 869 under the presidency of the papal legate, where the decrees of Nicholas I. respecting the deposition of Photius obtained ratification.[1]

Meanwhile the moral weakness of the princes contributed to increase the power of the Popes. The weapons of the Papacy, excommunications, were called more and more into use. By his fatal passion for a courtesan Lothar had effected a breach in the kingdom. Nicholas had boldly entered the breach, and Adrian followed him with equal perseverance. Soon after Thiutberga had been restored to her rightful position as wife, the unfortunate princess, ill-treated

[1] The Acts of the Eighth Council were translated into Latin by the Bibliothecarius Anastasius. Lewis had sent him to Byzantium for the purpose of negotiating a marriage between his daughter and Constantine, the son of Basil. *Vita. Hadr. II.* n. 629.

by her husband, had fled to Charles the Bald. She had announced to Nicholas her intention of dissolving her marriage with a tyrant, and of seeking peace in a convent. Nicholas instead condemned her —the tragic victim of a dogma—to continued torture. The Pope had refused to sanction her separation from an adulterer, and Lothar therefore was, on his side, also condemned to celibacy. Adrian excommunicated Waldrada. He addressed a furious letter to Lothar, and threatened him with the same punishment.[1] The King, strong only in his weakness for a woman, bent his head to the humiliation ; he implored Nicholas to allow him to appear in Rome in his own defence. The Pope, however, refused. On Nicholas's death, Lothar turned to his successor, hoping to induce him to yield to his wishes, and Adrian appears to have consented to the journey to Rome. The King had implored the Emperor to use his intercession with the Pope, to grant his separation from Thiutberga and his marriage with Waldrada, and announced that he would come in person. In June 869 Lothar entered Ravenna. The Emperor was at this time occupied in laying siege to Bari, but his envoys notified to Lothar that their master desired to avoid all complications, and therefore that he must not advance further. The infatuated lover, however, cared for nothing but the bliss that awaited him in the arms of Waldrada,

[1] *Quam ob rem cavendum est, ne cum ea pari mucrone percellaris sententiae, ac pro unius mulierculae passione et brevissimi temporis desiderio, vinctus et obligatus ad sulphureos foetores et ad perhenne traharis initium.* This letter and other documents relative to this matter are to be found in Regino, *Chron. A.* 866, 868.

and for which he was ready to sacrifice all the treasures of his kingdom. He hastened to his brother, he lavished entreaties and gifts until he won the Empress Engelberga to his side. The Emperor summoned Adrian to Monte Casino, whither Engelberga accompanied her brother-in-law. Lothar assailed the Pope with presents, but only succeeded in prevailing on Adrian to allow him to partake of the Communion. This Adrian himself administered to the impious King on July 1, 869, after the latter had sworn a solemn oath that from the time of her excommunication he had forborne all intercourse with Waldrada.[1] Engelberga journeyed from Monte Casino back to her husband; the Pope returned to Rome, the shameless Lothar following at his heels. Lothar's reception in the city was insulting: no priest came to meet him, he slunk with his retinue into S. Peter's and, unwelcomed, took up his abode in the neighbouring palace, the rooms of which had not even been swept for his arrival.[2] The Pope refused to allow him to attend mass, but invited him, however, to table in the Lateran, and ironically made return for the handsome gifts he had received by presenting the King with a garment called "Laena," a palm, and a rod.[3] The weak prince left Rome satisfied, and continued his journey to Lucca,

Lothar's perjury in Monte Casino.

[1] Hincmar, *A.* 869: *Ipse autem infelix, more Judae—impudenti fronte eamdam sacram communionem—accipere non pertimuit.* Gunther was also admitted to the Communion on this occasion. Regino erroneously transfers these occurrences to Rome.

[2] *Indeque solarium secus eccl. b. Petri mansionem habiturus, intravit, quem nec etiam scopa mundatum invenit:* Hincmar. Regino calls Lothar's reception honourable; Hincmar, however, is to be believed.

[3] *Laena* also signifies procuress.

where he and his followers were attacked by malaria. He proceeded onwards to Piacenza, and there died on August 10. In his death men recognised the judgment of heaven on perjury and profligacy.

His death at Piacenza, 869.

While Charles the Bald and Lewis of Germany attacked the estates of the dead, they afforded the Pope the opportunity of dealing with them as if they were robbers. The injured Emperor was himself reduced to beg for Adrian's intervention. Lewis was still engaged in the war against the Saracens in Southern Italy. He at length conquered Bari, where he took prisoner the Sultan in 871, and thereby aroused the jealousy of the Greeks, who had but feebly supported him in his great undertaking. Basil wrote him an ironical letter, in which he refused Lewis the title Basileus and sarcastically called him Riga. Lewis's answer is deserving of remark, and we quote it as confirming the idea which was entertained of the Roman Imperium at this period, and to show that the sanctity of the Imperial dignity was, through the Emperor's own admission, already held to proceed from the anointing of the Emperor by the hand of the Pope.

Lewis's Letter to Basil.

"Our uncles," he said, "glorious kings, although older in years than we, call us Imperator without envy, for they take into consideration the anointing and consecration by which we, through the laying on of the hands of the Pope and by means of his prayer, have risen by the Divine Will to the Imperium of the Roman Empire. One is the Empire of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, whose portion is the Church on earth, the government of which God has, nevertheless, not committed either to thee or to

me alone, but to us both that we might exist as one."[1] He speaks of how the kings of the Franks had attained to the Imperium, and says: "We have already received it from our grandfather, not as thou supposest by usurpation, but by the Will of God, the decision of the Church and of the Supreme Pontiff, through the laying on of hands and through anointing. Thou sayest truly, that we should call ourselves Emperor of the Franks and not of the Romans; but thou shouldest know that were we not Emperor of the Romans, neither could we be Emperor of the Franks, for from the Romans we received this name and this dignity, since from them first shone forth this highest consummation of supreme authority, and with it we assumed the divine government of the people and the city, and the defence and exaltation of the Mother of all churches of God, from which the race of our ancestors received first the kingdom and then the Empire.[2] For the princes of the Franks first called themselves kings, after this emperors, those namely who have been anointed as such by the Pope with the sacred oil. Thus our great grandfather Charles the Great, through anointing at the hands of the Pope, was, because of the love which he inspired, the first of our nation and family to be called emperor and become the anointed of the Lord; especially because such have been frequently raised to the Imperium, as without the divine operation

[1] *Unum est enim Imperium Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti, cujus pars est Ecclesia constituta in terris.*—*Ecclesia* here signifies Christendom. The letter of the year 871 is found in the *Anon. Salern*, c. 102 *ff*.

[2] *Quocumque gentem et urbem gubernandam* (a clear expression of supremacy), *et Matrem omnium Ecclesiarum Dei defendendam, atque sublimandam accepimus.*

through papal consecration, but only through nomination by the Senate and People, attained the Imperial dignity. Even without this some have been raised to the Imperial throne merely through acclamation by the soldiers, or have in various ways seized the sceptre of Roman Empire. If thou, however, calumniatest the action of the Roman pontiff, rather blame Samuel, because that he, rejecting Saul, whom he himself had previously anointed, did not disdain to anoint David king."

After Lewis had drawn this adroit parallel between Saul the rejected or the Greek Emperor and David or the Frankish King (we may remember that Charles the Great was also pleased to be called David) he says in conclusion to the Byzantine: "We have therefore attained to the Roman Empire by our orthodoxy, the Greeks, on the other hand, lost it by their kakodoxy. They have deserted not only the city and the seat of the Empire, but also the Roman people, have even renounced the Roman language, and have become utterly estranged."[1]

This letter, the composition of a clever priest, forms the weightiest document with regard to the conception of the Imperium produced since the days of Charles the Great. Referring to the past, it draws a definite conclusion from a long chain of historic premises. The twofold usurpation opposed to the legitimacy, David opposed to Saul, was now concealed under the grace of God and its operation

[1] *Romanorum Imperatores existere cessaverunt, deserentes non solum Urbem et sedem Imperii, sed et gentem Romanam, et ipsam quoque linguam amittentes, atque ad alia transmigrantes.*

through the high priest of religion. The unction which the Emperor received flowed from the same source that had consecrated the Major Domus of the Franks when he robbed the Merovingians of the crown, and since the rights of legitimacy could not tolerate the existence of other rights of a political or actual nature, these were set aside by the title of the Divine Will. Lewis, it is true, still quotes the Romans in general as the source of the Imperium, but only in a secondary degree; and while he no longer bestows a thought on the election through the people or the Diet, he always returns to the sentence of the Church and the papal unction. This view is partly to be traced to the policy of the Emperors themselves, who preferred to derive their office from papal consecration—that is to say, from God—rather than from the election by the vassals, who waxed ever more insolent, who desired to make the Empire dependent upon themselves, and who weakened and split up the Empire of Charles in order that they might rise to power on its ruins. It therefore followed that the Empire had come to be considered as altogether dependent on papal consecration, and that the Popes ventured to assert that the Imperial power was bestowed by them alone as a fief and emanation of their supreme sacerdotal power.

The Emperor Lewis made a prisoner in Benevento.

An unparalleled act of violence further showed the world how far the Empire had lost its majesty in 871. The victor of Bari, the saviour of Southern Italy, had withdrawn to Benevento with his spoils, while his dispersed army reduced some rebellious towns to subjection. His wife, Engelberga, his nobles and his

soldiers irritated the people of Benevento by their rapacity and insolence. Adelchis, however, the reigning prince, covetous of the spoils of the Saracens, conceived the bold idea of seizing the Emperor, whom he had often offended by his disobedience, whose anger he dreaded, and whose yoke, he, as well as the whole of Southern Italy, unwillingly bore. He therefore attacked him in his palace in August. After a wild scene of struggle and defence prolonged for three days, he took prisoner his Imperial guest, his wife and all the Franks. He robbed them of their valuables, he kept them in prison for more than a month, and forced a sworn promise from Lewis never to enter the Duchy of Benevento with an army, and never to take any revenge for the injuries he had suffered. Then, terrified by the landing of the Saracens at Salerno, he restored his prisoners to liberty. Thus was the Empire outraged and dishonoured by its vassals.[1]

The news of this insult caused indescribable dismay. Ballad singers sung it in the streets, the intelligence spread through every land, and Lewis was believed to be dead.[2] Thirsting for revenge, but

[1] Hincmar and Regino, *A.* 871. Above all, the contemporary Erchempert, c. 34. The *Anon. Salern.* c. 117 says that Lewis had troubled Benevento for three years. Andreas Presb. of Bergamo, a contemporary, also gives information of these events (*Mon. Germ.* v. 232). According to Mühlbacher (*Regest. der Karolinger*) the attack took place on August 13, the liberation of the prisoners on September 17.

[2] The ballad (Muratori, *Dissert.* xl.: Sismondi, *Litér. der Midi*, i. 15) shows that the *lingua volgare* was not yet (in 871) the language of poetry. The strain is that of our street songs, beginning: Give ear, all men, to the dreadful tale:

bound by oath and at the same time satisfied to have escaped further harm, the Emperor collected his scattered troops. He advanced into the Spoletan territory, where he deprived Duke Lambert of his dignity, and then turned towards Ravenna. At Whitsuntide in the following year (872) he came to Rome.[1] Received by the Pope in the Lateran with every honour, he submitted to the Pontiff the request that he would release him from the oath wrung from him at Benevento. An assembly of clergy and nobles granted the request. Roused to enthusiasm by his speech, those who adhered to him or the Empire were carried away by recollections of ancient times. The Roman parliament assembled (not assuredly amid the ruins of the Capitol, but in the Basilica of the Lateran or of S. Peter), pronounced Adelchis an enemy of the

He comes to Rome.

Audite omnes fines terrae horrore cum tristitia,
Quale scelus fuit factum Benevento Civitas.
Ludhuicum comprenderunt sancto, pio Augusto.
Beneventani se adunarunt ad unum consilium.
Adalferio loquebatur, et dicebant Principi:
Si nos eum vivum dimittemus, certes nos peribimus.
Celus magnum praeparavit in istam provinciam:
Regnum nostrum nobis tollit: nos habet pro nihilum.
Plures mala nobis fecit. Rectum est, ut moriad, &c.

[1] Hincmar, *A.* 872: *Hlud. autem imp. vigilia pentecostes Romam venit, et in crastinum coronatus ab Adriano papa.* Bouquet and Muratori believe that Lewis was again crowned by the Pope on account of the territories to which he had succeeded on the death of Lothar. I consider this coronation merely a ceremony. On great festivals the Pope occasionally placed the crown on the head of the Emperor. Such is said to have been the intention of Henry V. at Easter 1117.—The *Chron. Farf.* corroborates the year and date of Lewis's presence in Rome by a diploma already mentioned: *V. Kal. Junii, Ind. V. Actum in Civ. Roma, Palatio Imperatoris.*

Republic, and the rebellious vassals were placed under the ban of outlawry.[1] Nevertheless, the weakening of the Empire was regarded in general with secret satisfaction. Romans and Italians, dukes, bishops, counts, the Pope, the Saracens and the Normans all eagerly contributed to its overthrow. When, hastened by the rapid degeneration of the Carolingian house, the overthrow at last took place, it was followed by terrible times for Rome and the Papacy, which from the summit of power suddenly sank to the depths of humiliation.

3. John VIII., Pope, 872—Death of Lewis II.—The Sons of Lewis of Germany and Charles the Bald contend for the Possession of Italy—Charles the Bald, Emperor, 875—Decay of the Imperial Power in Rome—Charles the Bald, King of Italy—The German Faction in Rome—Excesses of the Nobility—Formosus of Portus.

The Church, however, was at this time fortunate in having a succession of Popes no less able than those who had freed Rome from the Byzantine yoke. While the throne of the Carolingians was occupied by a series of ever weaker rulers, the chair of Peter was filled by a set of men immeasurably their superiors in diplomatic skill, firmness and power.

[1] *Tunc a senatu Romanor. idem Adalgisus tyrannus atque hostis reipublicae declaratur, bellum adversus eum decernitur.* Regino *A.* 872. The chronicler (who died 915) informs us that Adalgisus fled to Corsica, that the Emperor did not advance in person against Benevento, but made over the war to his wife.

Adrian II. died, and the yet more vigorous John VIII., son of Gundo, a Roman probably of Lombard descent, was ordained on December 14, 872.[1] The Emperor Lewis II., the last Carolingian of vigorous mind, and of ideas worthy of the Empire, died in the course of a few years. After he had long and honourably striven in Southern Italy to rescue the kingdom from the Saracens and to heal its divisions, after he had vainly endeavoured to check the internal decay, the inevitable result of the feudal principle and the immunities of the bishoprics, he died at Brescia on August 12, 875, and was buried in the Church of S. Ambrosius at Milan.[2] Lewis was the first Emperor of mediaeval times to entangle himself in the fatal labyrinth of Italian politics, and having almost become an Italian, he perished in the troubles that overwhelmed him. His death constitutes an era in the history of the Empire. With him the Empire, losing power and dignity, sank to be a puppet-show in the hands of the Pope and the Italian nobles; while Italy herself fell into that state of lasting chaos which has continued down to our

John VIII., Pope, 872-882.

Death of the Emperor Lewis II., Aug. 12, 875.

[1] The *Annal. Bertin.* or Hincmar alone give the day of the ordination: *Adrianus p. moritur, et Johes archdiacon. Roman. eccl.* 19 *Kal. Jan. in locum ejus substituitur.—Johes, nat. Romanus, ex patre Gundo* —thus the *Vita* from the Catalogue in Watterich i. 27.

[2] We here read his epitaph, which says among other things:

Huic ubi firma virum mundo produxerat aetas,
Imperii nomen subdita Roma dedit . . .
Nunc obitum luges, infelix Roma, patroni,
Omne simul Latium, Gallia tota dehinc.

(*Dom Bouquet*, vii. 380.)

Andr. Presb.: *Ibi fui et partem aliquam portavi, et cum portantibus ambulavi a flumine qui dicitur Oleo usque ad flumen Adua.* c. 17,

own days, and which, owing to her geographical position, has made her the apple of discord between France and Germany.

Lewis left no heir but his daughter Ermengard. His uncles Charles the Bald of France and Lewis of Germany each strove for the possession of Italy and the Imperial crown. A Diet of the Empire, held at Pavia, at the instigation of the widowed Empress, who favoured the German party, was devoid of result, and the decision of the question was left to arms. The sons of Lewis, Charles the Fat and Carloman, were favoured by the powerful Margrave Berengar of Friuli, who through his mother Gisela was a natural grandson of Lewis the Pious. One after another they crossed the Alps to fight against their uncle, who, however, by force of gold and falsehoods reduced them to inactivity. The Imperial crown had already been assured to the despicable prince by the Pope. For even in the time of Lewis II., whose energy had been felt and dreaded in Rome, the Church had turned her eyes towards France; and Adrian had secretly promised Charles the Bald that on the Emperor's death he would give the crown to none but him.[1] The thought of bestowing it on a King, representative of the German nationality, was still far distant, or appeared dangerous on account of the too close alliance of Italy with Germany. John VIII. therefore did not hesitate to decide in favour of the Frankish party, which, besides being the

[1] Ep. 34 Hadr. II., Labbé, vii. 443. He heaps flattering epithets on the King, whom he had irritated by his attacks on the Gallican Church.

stronger, gave him hopes of active help against the Roman nobility and the dreaded Saracens.[1] Through the Bishops Formosus of Portus, Gadericus of Velletri and John of Arezzo, he invited Charles the Bald to come to Rome for his coronation. Charles readily accepted the invitation. On December 17, 875, he was solemnly received in S. Peter's by the Pope, and on Christmas day was crowned Emperor of the Romans.[2]

Charles the Bald crowned Emperor, 875.

The vote of both the Pope and the Romans had been obtained by such vast sums of money that his German enemies likened Charles to Jugurtha, who had bribed the corrupt Roman Senate.[3] And since Charles had not, like his predecessors, already received the crown of Empire by the will of an Imperial father and election by an Imperial Diet, he was obliged to humiliate himself as a candidate, to solicit the vote of the Roman nobility; and the Pope, in a speech such as had never hitherto been heard, ventured publicly to designate the Roman Emperor as a creature of his own.[4] We have not full knowledge of the treaty

[1] The bitterest enemies of the Pope were the Margraves of Tuscany and Spoleto, the Roman nobles and the Saracens; against all of whom John VIII. hoped for help from France, as his miserable letters show.

[2] Aimoin gives the year 876, *De Gest. Francor.* v. c. 32, and Hincmar already reckons from the day of the coronation. The date of Christmas 875 is established by the Synod of Pavia (February 876), which ratified the Imperial election. The just crowned Charles dated his diploma for *Farfa*: *VII. Kal. Jan.—Imp. ejus. I. Actum in S. Petro, Ind. IX.*

[3] Annalist of Fulda: *Omnemq. Senatum populi R. pecunia more Jugurthino corrupit:* Regino, *Chron. A.* 877: *Iampridem imperatoris nomen a praesule sedis ap. Johanne ingenti pretio emerat.*

[4] *Acta Conv. Ticin.* (*Mon. Germ.* iii. 528), where John VIII. lays

which Charles the Bald had formed with the Church. But since he had received the crown from the hands of a benevolent donor, the concessions which he made must have been great. Had the donation of a feeble prince been of equal value with those of Lewis the Pious, a powerful Emperor, they would have occupied, as an important diploma, a marked place in the history of the Papacy.[1] The Imperial majesty sank with Charles to the depth of degradation, that of the Popes rose to a lofty height. The Constitutions of Charles the Great and Lothar fell to decay in Rome: the rights of the Imperial power ceased or existed only as an empty name. The Empire became the toy now of the Popes, now of the great feudal vassals; and the Italian Counts could soon vie

Decay of the Imperial rights in Rome.

stress on his *eligimus merito et approbavimus—ad Imp. Romani sceptra proveximus*. Nevertheless he did not venture to pass over the ratification of the clergy and *ampli Senatus, totiusque Rom. Pop. gentisque togatae*. The reminiscences of antiquity became ever more distinct. See also the Roman Council of 877, and also that of Pontigon, July 876. (Labbé, T. xi. 289.) A German chronicler says simply: *a papa accepit benedictionem imperialem. Annal. Vedastini.*

[1] According to Ep. ix. of John VIII. to Landulf of Capua, Charles the Bald awarded Capua to the Church: *de terrae vestrae pacta—nostro juri potestatique commisit*; the *Libell. de Imp. Potes.* adds to this Calabria, Samnium, Benevento, Spoleto, Arezzo and Chiusi. According to it Charles renounced the Imperial right in Rome (*perdonans illis jura Regni*), and the right of the presence of the Missus at the papal election. This statement must be accepted with caution. Charles expressly recognised the primacy of Rome (in the *Convent. Ticinens.*).—Ferdin. Hirsch (*Schenkung Carl's des Kahlen für P. Johann und der Lib. de imp. pot.*) has striven to prove that Charles had bestowed a Privilegium on the Pope, not on the occasion of the Imperial coronation, but only in the year 876. He rejects the account of this donation given in the *Libellus*.

on equal terms with the crown of Charles, as vassals of whose Empire they had had their origin.

The new Emperor remained in Rome only until January 5, 876. He hastened to Pavia, followed by the Pope himself, and here in an assembly of the bishops and nobles of the Italian kingdom he was not only confirmed in the Imperial dignity, but also previously elected King of Italy and crowned by Anspert, Archbishop of Milan. His predecessors since the days of Charles the Great had been simply nominated by a decree of the Empire and by a Diet outside Italy. The election of Charles the Bald therefore forms a turning point in Italian history. In it was shown the extraordinarily increased power of the Papacy, of the bishops, of the Italian nobles, as also the distinct appearance of a national spirit in Northern Italy.[1] The King resigned to Duke Boso, whose sister Richilda he had married, the administration of Italian affairs. He himself travelled to France, to receive recognition as Emperor from the Diet of those provinces assembled in July at Ponthion. He appeared on this occasion in magnificent Byzantine vestments, and received as a vassal a golden sceptre from the papal legate.

After John had reduced the Imperial power to submission, he returned from Pavia to Rome, summoned by the advance of the Saracens and the hostile attitude of the civic nobility. To the victory acquired over the Empire succeeded a condition of such anarchy as soon resulted in a serious defeat for the Papacy, no longer defended by the Imperial arm.

[1] The Bishops and Counts announce: *nos — Italici Regni Regem eligimus*—a formal royal election. *Acta Conv. Ticin.*

Rarely have the plans of ambition been turned into ridicule by an irony so bitter as that which the Popes now experienced. Within the city was a powerful party favourable to the Germans, who maintained communication with the widowed Empress, with Berengar of Friuli, Adalbert of Tuscany and the Margraves of Spoleto and Camerino. This party had opposed the election of Charles the Bald. It aspired to independence, and was in every way a source of great anxiety to the Pope. The character of its members reflected the barbarism of the times, but since we find among them the name of Formosus, a man esteemed by his contemporaries as a saint, some doubt may be permitted concerning the truth of the accusations levelled against them.

The German party in Rome.

Formosus of Portus, famous for his mission in Bulgaria, prominent among the Roman clergy through his learning and talents, had incurred the hatred of the suspicious Pope and of several cardinals. When previously sent to invite Charles to his coronation, the mission had either been unwillingly undertaken, or, concealing the views which inclined him to the German party, he had acquiesced in it from motives of prudence. Being, as a prominent man, secure of the adherence of a large faction, he may have been suspected of aiming at the papal crown. For unknown reasons he had left his bishopric of Portus. He was consequently reproached with having conspired with the Romans against both Emperor and Pope.

Formosus,

The nobles of the city formed a powerful family alliance. Among them were Generals of Militia or ministers of the Palace, a Nomenclator Gregory and

and the Roman rebels.

his son-in-law George, his daughter Constantina, the Secundicerius Stephen, and Sergius, a Magister Militum. George had murdered his wife, the niece of Benedict III., in order to marry Constantina[1]; and through the influence of his father-in-law, and through bribery of the judges, had succeeded in evading punishment. Sergius, also, nephew of the great Pope Nicholas I., had repudiated his wife to follow the example of a royal adulterer, and to live with Walwisindula, his Frankish mistress. The new Imperial election and the return of the Pope forced the transgressors to leave Rome at a time when the Saracens hovered before the gates of the city. George and Gregory first robbed the Lateran and other churches, then opened the gate of S. Pancratius at night, and escaped to seek a hiding-place in the Spoletan territory. Their action furnished the Pope with grounds for the accusation he brought against them, of having opened an entrance to the Mohammedans. On April 19, 876, he assembled a Synod in the Pantheon, and after the accusations had been read, he pronounced sentence of excommunication against the offenders and the Bishop of Portus, if they failed to appear within a given date. They failed, and the threat was fulfilled. Formosus was, moreover, deprived of his bishopric and deposed from every ecclesiastical office.[2] There is scarcely

Formosus banished and deposed in 876.

[1] *Georgius, cui cognomen fuit de Aventino*; he is thus designated by the *Libellus Auxilii in defens. Formosi*, c. 4.

[2] Ep. 319, John VIII. *Ad univ. Gallos et Germanos de damnatione Formosi ep., Gregorii nomenclatoris, et alior. qui Romae in synodo fuerant excommunicati* (Mansi, Con. xvii. 236). These Acts of the Synod were read at Pontigon. Galletti (*Del. Prim.* p. 71) has en-

any doubt that he and the fugitive Romans were in league with the Margraves of Spoleto and Camerino, as also with Adalbert of Tuscany, since we find them soon after under the protection of these princes. A treacherous understanding with the Saracens is, however, improbable; Formosus, at least, must be acquitted of so base an act.

4. The Saracens devastate the Campagna — John's Letters of Complaint — League between the Saracens and the Seaports of Southern Italy —Energy of John VIII. — He forms a Fleet, negotiates with the Princes of South Italy, defeats the Saracens at the Cape of Circe— Condition of Southern Italy—John VIII. builds Johannipolis beside S. Paul's.

The Saracens devastate the Roman Campagna.

From the year 876 onwards the Mohammedans, advancing into the Roman territory, plundered the Sabina, laid waste Tuscany and Latium, and repeatedly appeared before the gates of the city. Convents, farms, the Domuscultae, the settlements established with such trouble by so many Popes, were levelled with the ground, the coloni were slain or sold into slavery, and the Campagna was reduced to a fever-stricken desert. In John's agonised letters addressed in 876 and 877 to Boso, Charles the Bald,

deavoured to explain the relationship of these nobles. L. Richter in the "Programm" of the University of Marburg, 1843, publishes the decisions of the second Synod of John VIII. of June 30, where Formosus is charged: *venerabilia monasteria hujus ecclesiae quibus praefuit sacrilege depraedasse.*

the Empress Richilda, the bishops of the Empire, and mankind at large, we hear Rome's cry of despair, a cry such as had arisen in the days of Gregory in presence of the Lombards. The soldiers of Mohammed proved, however, more ruthless enemies than the troops of Agilulf. The city scarcely knew how to lodge and feed the swarms of peasants, of monks and clergy who, fleeing from the ruined churches, sought shelter within her walls. "Cities, fortresses, villages have perished with their inhabitants, the bishops are dispersed. Within the walls of Rome are collected the remains of the wholly destitute population; without all is devastation and desertion; nothing more remains, save, what may God avert, the ruin of the city. The whole Campagna is depopulated, nothing is left to the convents or other places of religion, nothing to support the Senate. The neighbourhood of the city has been so utterly devastated, that not a single inhabitant, man or child, is to be found." Thus John wrote to Charles the Bald, who in the depths of his despair he now wished could be transformed into a powerful Emperor. "Prostrating himself on the ground before his magnificence," he now humbly solicits his help.[1] Charles, meantime, had left Rome, —the city which at his coronation he had sworn to protect by his Imperial arm,—a prey to the sword of the Saracen.

[1] Ep. 21, 30, 31, 32, 34. In the 32nd letter he says, that the Saracens frequently came up to the walls; and we incidentally learn that the Anio was already called Tiberinus (Teverone in the vulgar tongue). *Ita ut—Tiberinum fluvium, qui olim Albula dicebatur, juxta Sabinor. confinia pertransierint.*

The death of the warlike Lewis II. was now felt throughout Italy, whilst the political conditions of the South facilitated the conquests of the Saracens. Religion was no hindrance to intercourse or even alliance between the Mohammedans and the princes of South Italy. Even in the time of Lewis II. these princes had made use of the unbelievers for their own purposes, and each Emperor in turn had raised the complaint that Naples had become a second Palermo or a second Africa.[1] Commercial advantage, as also the support which the Saracens offered against each other and against the Emperors both of the East and West, induced the lesser princes to form alliances with the infidels. The designs of the Roman Church were, moreover, well-known to the Saracens. The Church had already cast longing glances towards the patrimonies in Naples and Calabria, had advanced claims on Capua and Benevento, and made use of the state of disorder which prevailed in South Italy to acquire territory there. Restricted after the fall of Bari to Tarento, the Saracens had equipped a fresh fleet against Italy. When therefore the death of the Imperial conqueror removed the greatest hindrance out of their way, they forced Naples, Gaeta, Amalfi and Salerno not only to make peace, but to unite in attacking the coast of the State of the Church, and even Rome itself.[2] Their only energetic opponent now was Pope John, and the

[1] Letter of Lewis to Basil.

[2] *Salernum, Neapolim, Gaietam et Amalfim pacem habentes cum Saracenis, navalibus Romam graviter angustiabant depopulationibus.* Erchembert, *A.* 875–876 (*Mon. Germ.* v. 253).

activity which the priest displayed put kings to shame, and covered his memory with military renown. A man such as the Pope well deserved to govern Rome. In presence of the formidable league, which, it was said, was sending a hundred vessels against him, he never lost courage. He wrote urgent letters to Charles the Bald imploring aid, and Charles sent him Lambert of Spoleto, who in 876 had been reinstated in his dukedom, and Lambert's brother Guido, instructing them to accompany the Pope to Naples and Capua, and support his attempt to dissolve the league. The princes proved, however, but doubtful assistants. John VIII. hastened in person to Naples early in the year 877, when his prayers and entreaties succeeded in separating Guaiferius of Salerno from the Saracen alliance. He then entered into eager negotiations with Amalfi. The already prosperous commercial town was at this time governed by Pulcharius as elective Duke or Praefecturius. From Amalfi the Pope next turned to the Greek admirals Gregory and Theophylact, whom he entreated to send vessels to the port of the Tiber.[1]

Great activity of John VIII. under dread of the Saracens.

Not even Gregory I. when harassed by the Lombards had displayed greater energy; and John possessed the advantage of more extensive means than his predecessor. He himself manned Roman men-of-war, and for the first time we may speak of a papal navy, insignificant though it may have been.

He forms a Papal navy.

[1] *Decem bona et expedita chelandia ad portum nostrum transmittas, ad litora nostra de illis furibus et piratis Arabibus expurganda.* Ep. xlvi. Joh. VIII.; and similarly Ep. ccxi. This after the Greek Emperor had sent a fleet.

These vessels were called dromons, as in the days of Belisarius. They were as a rule 170 feet long, were armed with two castles, one on the forecastle and one on the poop, equipped with machines of war for projectiles, combustibles and grappling-irons. They were propelled by a hundred oars rowed by galley slaves, while the marines occupied the middle and castles.[1] The possession of this little fleet, which took up its position at Portus, filled the Pope with pride; he wrote to the Empress Engelberga rejoicing that he no longer required men of Gaeta since he was now able to protect himself.[2] His exertions in Naples, however, had had but little result, since the Duke Sergius II. could not be induced to renounce his lucrative alliance with the Arabs. The Pope hurled an excommunication against him and his city, armed Guaiferius against him, and without more ado beheaded twenty-two Neapolitan prisoners.[3] John immediately after returned to Rome, to discover that the coast by Fundi and Terracina had been pillaged by the Saracens. He only remained five days, and sailing with the fleet from Portus, met the Mohammedans at the Cape of Circe, took eighteen of their vessels, liberated six hundred Christian slaves,

Defeats the Saracens at the Cape of Circe.

[1] Guglielmotti, i. 81.

[2] *Quae nostra sunt defendimus—Dromones vid. cum caeteris navibus construentes, et caetera vasa bellica.* Fragment of a letter in *Ivo Decret.* pars x. c. 69; also in c. 68 he speaks of *nostri dromones* in a letter to Marinus and Pulcharius.

[3] *Neapolites milites apprehensos decollari fecit* (*scil.* Guaiferius) *sic enim monuerat papa.* Erchempert. Joh. VIII. later counselled Bishop Athanasius: *Si majores Saracenor. quantos melius potes, quos nominatim quaerimus, cum aliis omnibus ceperis, et jugulatis aliis, eos nobis direxeris.* Ep. ccxciv.

and killed a number of the enemy. This is the first time in history that a Pope made war as an admiral. While thus engaged in putting the Saracens to rout, John turned his glance towards the disordered provinces in Southern Italy, whose princes he hoped to bring into subjection to the Sacred Chair.[1]

He hastened to Traetto, which belonged to the Church, with the object of effecting a league between the princes, while the Greek fleet obtained a still greater victory over the Saracens in Neapolitan waters. Immediately after, the Pope is found supporting a revolution in Naples. Bishop Athanasius had here seized his brother Sergius, torn out his eyes, and in this condition sent him to Rome. Here the Pope allowed him to die a lingering death in prison. The fratricide, the act of a bishop, was regarded by him, the Pope, as a welcome occurrence. The murderer was rewarded with a stipulated sum of money and praised by letter.[2] So far did the temporal needs of his kingdom prevail as to force the Pope out of the sphere of the apostolic virtues of the priesthood, with which earthly interests were morally incompatible.

Events soon after (in the spring of 878) compelled

[1] For this naval victory see *Ivo Decret.* x. c. 71: John's undated letter *Imperatori et Imperatrici. Cum reversi fuissemus* (from Naples *A.* 877, and not from France *A.* 878)—*non plus quam quinque diebus in urbe manentes, quamvis corporis non modica detineremur molestia, exivimus cum fidelibus nostris—coepimus naves* 18. *Saraceni—multi occisi—captivos fere* 600 *liberavimus.*

[2] *A proprio germano captus est, et Romam mittitur effossis oculis, ibique miserabiliter vitam finivit.* Ep. lxvi. John's letter to Athanasius rejoicing over this act of fratricide.

John VIII. to fly to France, and destroyed his schemes in South Italy. Before leaving Rome he found himself obliged to buy a peace with the Saracens, and to consent to the payment of a yearly tribute of twenty-five thousand silver mancusi.[1] Shortly before this he had concluded a treaty with Amalfi, by which the inhabitants had pledged themselves to the annual payment of ten thousand mancusi, to protect the coast from Traetto to Civita Vecchia with their vessels; and the Pope was indignant that the republic had not fulfilled its promises before he left Rome.[2] On his return from France in 879 he found that he had been betrayed. The infamous Athanasius, at the same time Bishop and Duke of Naples, in miniature the likeness of the Pope, followed the course of his brother Sergius and unhesitatingly formed an alliance with the infidels. This alliance served as a defence against the Emperor of Byzantium, with whom the Pope was now on good terms. In vain John travelled back to Naples and Gaeta; in vain he showered his gold, in vain thundered his anathemas against the traitor. The people of Amalfi laughed at his measures. The astute merchants pocketed their ten thousand mancusi. They explained

[1] This he says in a letter to King Carloman dated from Genoa while on his journey to France. Ep. 89: *fesso mihi paganorum persecutione ac gladio, atque exactionis census viginti quinque millium in argento mancusorum annualiter.*

[2] Amari misplaces this treaty in the year 877, and the Congress of Traetto; Guglielmotti in 879, and after John's return from France. I think, however, that there is no more probable date than that at which John was thinking of leaving Rome. See Ep. 69 to Landulf of Capua dated *Nov. Ind. XI.*, therefore 877, since the *Ind. XI.* began in Sept. and Ep. 74. Later letters treating of this event are: 209, 225, 242.

that according to contract twelve thousand fell to their share, and continued to withhold their vessels and to deal with the Saracens as with allies. John thundered his excommunications, and seldom has a Pope been so lavish of his curses. They were already the customary weapons of the Lateran armoury.[1]

The condition of the Lombard and Greek provinces in South Italy grew worse with every succeeding year. Saracens and Greeks plundered the fertile plains, and frequently fought under the same banner with the Neapolitans against Salerno. Pandulf of Capua, forced to recognise the sovereignty of the Pope, summoned the Mohammedans into his dismembered country.[2] Fears on the part of Catholic princes of the temporal designs of a Pope thus constituted one of the chief causes which gave the Saracens a foothold in South Italy. If we follow the history of these provinces at this period, we grow bewildered amid the shameless intrigue, the treacherous arts, and the brutal savagery of the characters depicted.

Bishop Athanasius accepted the Arabs as his allies against Rome and against the Greeks in the neighbourhood of his city. The intruders had here established themselves at the foot of Vesuvius about the year 881. They founded a colony at Agropolis, near Paestum. Summoned by Duke Docibilis of Gaeta in dread of the Pope, they first occupied a

[1] Ep. 69, 74, 209, 225, 242, 265, 270, and Erchempert, c. 44.

[2] At this time the Amphitheatre of Capua was used as a fortress: it was called, like the Roman one, *Colossus*. Erchempert, c. 55, 56. Of Pandulf he relates: *sequenti vero anno* (881) *generaliter motionem faciens cum suis Neapolitibus et Saracenis super colossum, quo filii Landonis degebant, insedit.* Guaiferius is thence called *Colossense.*

The Saracens settle on the banks of the Garigliano.

camp near Itri, and then moved to the right shore of the Liris or Garigliano, in the neighbourhood of the ruins of that Minturnae, in the marshes of which the fugitive Marius had once lain concealed. They here built a huge fortress, which they succeeded in retaining for forty years. From the banks of the Garigliano they wandered over Campania, spreading death and destruction over the beautiful land. Even the celebrated monasteries of Monte Casino and S. Vincenzo on the Vulturnus, solitary but flourishing centres of learning, went up in flames and long remained in ruins.[1]

John VIII. builds Johannipolis.

As regards Rome itself, John's letters form the sole memorials of that terrible period of distress caused by the Saracens. Another great monument, which owed its origin to the dangers of the time, has perished. John VIII. built a wall around the basilica of S. Paul, as Leo IV. had built one round S. Peter's. The neighbouring rocky hill offered an excellent support to the fortification, and there the Pope must have

[1] Monte Casino was destroyed as early as 884, and the Abbot Bertharius murdered. The monks fled to Teano, where in 889 the autograph rule of Benedict was burnt, afterwards to Capua. Monte Casino was only restored by Aligern, who died 986. To the monastery we owe the preservation of the Regesta of John VIII., which were thence brought to Rome, and which form the first volume of the Vatican Regesta. G. Levi, *Il Tomo I dei Reg. vaticani* (*Arch. della Società Romano*, iv. 162*f.*). Numerous archives are preserved at Monte Casino, which are far from being exhausted for the history of Southern Italy. Precious above all is the *Cod. Diplom. Cajetanus* (extending from 772 until 1638); copied by Don Giov. Battista Frederici. I adorn this page with the names of Don Luigi Tosti, and Don Sebastiano Kalefati, the keeper of the archives of M. Casino, and gratefully record the readiness with which these learned men placed their archives at my disposal.

erected a fortress. Making use of the portico which led from the gate to the church, he apparently also enclosed the entire suburb with a wall, and bestowed the name of Johannipolis on his building. Of this praiseworthy monument of papal energy not the slightest trace remains. No historian records the building of John's town, and our knowledge of its foundation is solely due to the copy of the inscription which was engraved over a gate of the new fortress:—

Hic Murus salvator adest invictaque Porta,
Quae reprobos arcet, suscipiatque Pios.
Hanc Proceres intrate, Senes, Juvenesque togati,
Plebsque sacrata Dei, limina sancta petens.
Quam Praesul Domini patravit rite Johannes,
Qui nitidis fulsit moribus ac meritis.
Praesulis Octavi de nomine facta Johannis
Ecce Joannipolis urbs veneranda cluit.
Angelus hanc Domini Paulo cum Principe Sanctus
Custodiat Portam semper ab hoste nequam,
Insignem nimium muro quam construit amplo
Sedis apostolicae Papa Johannes ovans.
Ut sibi post obitum celestis janua regni
Pandatur, Christo sat miserante Deo.[1]

[1] Muratori, Diss. xxvi., Torrigius, &c., p. 360; in addition De Rossi, *Inscr. chr. Urb. R.*, ii. pars i. 326. The *Anon. Magliab.* xxviii. Cod. 51, n. 28, mentions this *Johannipolis, quae in odiernis non videtur, et antiquitus pulcherrima aedificata fuit*, and says that it was more than two miles in circumference. A document of Gregory VII. of the year 1074 relative to S. Paul's confirms to this church *totum Castellum S. Pauli quod vocatur Joannipolim, cum Mola juxta se* (*Bullar. Cassin.* ii. const. cxii.).

CHAPTER VI.

1. Difficult Position of John VIII. towards Lambert and the Emperor—He again confirms Charles the Bald in the Imperial Dignitiy—Synods of Rome and Ravenna, 877—Decrees of John concerning the Patrimonies — Papal Exchequer Lands—Unavailing Attempts to avert Feudalism —Death of Charles the Bald — Triumph of the German Party — Threatening Attitude of Lambert and the Exiles—Lambert attacks Rome and takes the Pope Prisoner — John VIII. escapes to France.

The Saracens and the complications in South Italy have for a time diverted our attention from the events originating in the altered relations between the city and the Empire. These relations had, however, added to the difficulties in which Rome already found herself. Lambert, reinstated in the Duchy of Spoleto, in the hope of advancing his own aims towards independence and increased authority, had done all in his power to aggravate the disorder which prevailed in Italy. Rome had already felt his hand. The nobles condemned by John had sought refuge with Lambert, and, after the manner of fugitives, had assailed him with entreaties for their restoration.

Suspicion sown between the Emperor and the Pope found nourishment in the aims of the sons of Lewis the German, who on their side were eager to gain possession of Italy. Even the friendly relations which existed between Rome and the Greek Emperor, whose generals had again appeared, and frequently victorious, in Southern Italy, further strengthened Charles's distrust, while the consciousness of his own weakness increased his suspicion. He had given the Romans sufficient ground to lament their choice of Emperor, and to wish for another ruler in his place. Charles's correspondence with John is not forthcoming, but a letter of the Pope's throws light on the transaction. Lambert, in the name of the Emperor, had demanded hostages from the Romans. John had refused. "Never," he declared, could he "believe that such was the will of the Emperor." He wrote to Lambert that the Roman nobility would rather choose death than acquiesce in such an unheard-of demand. He implored Lambert not to trouble himself about Rome, and assured him that the discontent which the Romans cherished towards the Emperor would vanish like a cobweb without his interference.[1]

The Pope justified himself against the suspicions of his loyalty in the memorable Council which he assembled in Rome in February 877. Charles was

Council in Rome, 877.

[1] *Romanor, filios sub isto coelo non legitur fuisse obsides datos, quanto minus istorum qui fidelitatem Augustalem et mente custodiunt, et opere Deo juvante perficiunt.* Ep. 61. The date *Ind. XI.* 12 *Kal. Nov.* is wrong. The demand for hostages was made prior to the Council of February 877, and this tranquillised the Emperor.

here confirmed afresh in the Imperial dignity, the claims of the sons of Lewis of Germany (who had died on August 28, 876) were thereby set aside, and a division in the Empire was thus avoided. The dread of the Saracens and of the exiles, the hope of Imperial help, the fear of Lambert and of the German princes, lent a character of utterly shameless flattery to the speech made by the Pope in the presence of the German bishops. Charles the Bald might have been entitled to some praise for the protection he had extended to learning; the Roman Church might extol him for the many benefits which it owed him; but John's exaggerated eulogy was such as to make the Imperial phantom ridiculous in the eyes of all. He called Charles the Star of Salvation which had risen on the world; he asserted that God had foreordained his election before the creation of the earth. He invested the wretched monarch with a galaxy of virtues such as would have overpowered even Charles the Great.[1] He wound up his speech by declaring that he had elected and confirmed him on account of these virtues, in accordance with the bishops, the illustrious Senate, all Romans, and all who wore the toga. The bishops on their side again ratified the election.[2]

The Empire of Charles the Bald confirmed anew.

[1] *Ecce nobis Carolum Christianiss. principem superna providentia, praescitum a se et praeelectum ante mundi constitutionem.* Contrast with this the just and well-expressed praise of Charles the Great: *atque intra brevissim. tempus ita industria pietatis studio egit, ut novus quodammodo videretur mundus, magnis luminaribus venustatus, et variis vernantibus floribus adornatus. Concil. Roman. mense Febr. Ind. X.* 877. (Labbé, xi. 296.)

[2] *Elegimus hunc merito, et approbavimus una cum annisu et voto omnium fratrum et coepiscoporum nostrorum, amplique Senatus, totiusque Romani populi, gentisque togatae*; and the Bishops confirm:

Thus far had the Imperium of the great Charles already sunk.

Charles the Bald, accompanied by his wife and an army, actually came to Italy. At Orba he received a copy of the Acts of the Roman Synod, and the information that the Pope would meet him at Pavia. John was now at Ravenna, where he had held a Synod in August 877. Among the resolutions here passed were some concerning the patrimonies of the Church, and a decree had been promulgated forbidding the alienation of these territories under any title whatever of a feudal nature. The conception of the *Feudum*, a word which had not yet come into use, was generally expressed by *Beneficium*. Landed estates were conferred as *Beneficia*; others, in consequence of a written petition (*precarium*), were given in usufruct as so-called *Praestaria*, and from the instrument of investiture (called *libellum*) these estates were termed *libellaria*.[1] The ever-increasing confusion of all relations, where avarice and rapacity, violence and treachery of every kind, struggled for the possession of wealth, and invented innumerable titles to that end, rendered the alienation of the property easy. The benefices thus transformed themselves into the hereditary possessions of those who had obtained them. The Roman magnates, from whose midst the Popes were elected, eagerly

quem elegistis eligimus.—This Synod is mentioned by Aimoinus v. c. 35, and Hincmar, *Annal. A.* 877.

[1] The conception of the *precaria* and *praestaria* is explained by the Formulae of Marculfus; ii. n. v. 109, xxvii. 241.—ii. n. 40, 174, xxviii. 243 *praestaria* is thus explained: *ad praestitum beneficium tibi praestare*, after the petition, the *praecaria*, had been delivered.

stretched forth their hands over the patrimonies; and the Popes soon found themselves obliged to squander S. Peter's estates on these partisans under the form of leases, repaying in this way their own elevation, or securing adherents. To prevent the disintegration of the property of the Church, John appealed to the Synod of Ravenna in August 877. Under the Carolingians it had become the custom, on the ground of the patronage of the great, to invest bishops, counts, and even women of noble birth with convents or churches. John forbade the convents or churches in Ravenna, in the Pentapolis, in the Emilia, or in Roman or Lombard Tuscany, to be given as benefices, excepting such only as had either been given for the special use of the Roman Church, to the inhabitants of the Roman Duchy, or had been allotted to the Papal Exchequer.[1] The possessions immediately belonging to the Papal Fiscus had been expressly specified. The Appian patrimony, the Labicanense or Campaninum, Tiburtinum, Theatinum, both the Sabine territories, the Patrimonium Tusciae, the Portico of S. Peter's (the Leonine City), the Roman Mint, all public taxes, the riparian dues, the harbour (Portus) and Ostia.[2] It was expressly

John VIII. prohibits the alienation of the Property of the Church.

[1] Canon. xvii.: *exceptis illis—quib. pro utilitatib. et speciali servitio S. Rom. Eccl. vel Ducatus vel uniuscujusque loci habitatorib. praebetur, vel ad nostra dispensanda constituti sunt vel constituentur.* The idea of the Duchy remained; the extent of the ecclesiastical State was the same as it had been in the time of Charles. We hear nothing of Capua, Gaeta, Benevento, Corsica, Sicily or Sardinia. Can. xviii. determines that the payment of tithes shall only be made to the priests of parish churches.

[2] Art. xv.: *Interdicimus ut amodo et deinceps nullus quilibet homo*

ordained that these patrimonies could not be conferred as fiefs. The Roman Church desired to farm out her property as before. She strove in vain, however, to exclude the principle of German feudalism, and its inevitable results—the complete alienation of the property with which she had been vested, and the appearance of a crowd of dangerous hereditary tyrants.

After the Synod, John hastened to join the Emperor, whom he met at Vercelli. Together they travelled to Pavia, but the tidings that Carloman was advancing with a powerful army from Germany terrified the craven-hearted Charles. He hastily left Pavia; after his wife had been crowned by the Pope in Tortona, he fled back to France; while John, distressed at the failure of the promised expedition against the Saracens, returned to Rome.[1] He shortly after learnt that Charles had died on his flight (October 13), a powder which his Jewish physician had given him as an antidote against fever having, it was said, hastened his end. On his deathbed he had expressed a wish to be buried in S. Denis;

Death of Charles the Bald, Oct. 13, 877.

petat patrimonia S. nostrae eccl.—Utrumque Sabinense: the Sabina therefore now belonged to the Apostolic Exchequer. The Porticus S. Petri was also regarded as papal property in saec. xii. by the Senate. *Moneta Romano:* the papal right of coining money is here mentioned for the first time. *Ordinaria et actionaria publica:* public revenues, tribute, census, &c. *Ripam: Ripaticum* or *Teloneum* of the rivers. Portus and Ostia belonged to the papal exchequer. The conclusion runs: *sed haec omnia in usum salarii S. palatii Lateran. perpetualiter maneant.* Art. xvi. ordained, that no one should *monasteria, cortes, massas et salas Eccl. beneficiali more aut scripto, aut aliquolibet modo petere, recipere, vel conferre.* The Beneficium lasted for life.

[1] *Annal. Fuld., A.* 877; Aimon. V. c. 35; Hincmar, *A.* 877.

instead of this the Emperor of Rome was enclosed in a cask lined with pitch and covered with leather, and was laid in the ground of a hermitage near Lyons.[1]

The death of Charles the Bald produced an immediate change in political affairs; the French party fell with him, while the German triumphed. Carloman, who remained with his troops in North Italy, succeeded in gaining the votes of the bishops and counts for his Italian election. He demanded the Imperial crown at the hands of the Pope, and John VIII. was obliged to veil his real intentions under negotiations. This sudden rise of the German party filled him with dread; his enemies in Rome, the exiles in Spoleto, rejoiced, and Lambert assumed a threatening attitude. The affrighted Pope wrote flattering letters to Lambert, calling him the sole protector of the Church and its most faithful defender. He had heard that Lambert wished to lead his enemies, the already thrice excommunicated Romans, back to the city; he expressed astonishment at his intention, since he and Lambert were at peace. He forbade him to come to Rome, and laid the like prohibition upon Adalbert, Margrave of Tuscany, whom he termed his open adversary.[2] Lambert returned a contemptuous answer. He even violated the forms of respect due to the Pope so far as to

Carloman aspires to the Imperial Crown.

[1] Obsequies worthy of a Diogenes: *quem pro foetore non valentes portare, miserunt eum in tonna (!) interius exteriusque picata quam coriis involverunt, quod nihil ad tollendum foetorem perfecit. Unde ad cellam quamdam monachorum Lugdunensis episcopii, quae Nautoadis dicitur, vix pervenientes, illud corpus cum ipsa tonna terrae mandaverunt.* Hincmar, *A.* 877.

[2] Ep. 72 ad Lambert, *Comitem. Novemb. Ind. XI.*

address him, as he would have done a layman, simply with the title "your nobility," and thereby offended John. Lambert further requested that the Pope would not in future send him legates without first asking permission.[1] John finally announced his intention of going to France to treat with Carloman for aid in his difficulties. The pressure to which he had been subjected at the hands of the Saracens during the last two years and the continued attacks of these—the natural—enemies of the Apostolic Chair, rendered his longer sojourn in Rome impossible, and furnished him with an additional pretext for the journey. He admonished Lambert, under terror of the anathema, during his absence to refrain from any attempts to injure the territory of S. Peter or "the priestly and imperial city of Rome."[2]

The imprudent announcement of a journey to France, which could have no other motive than that of summoning Lewis, son of Charles the Bald, to arms against Carloman, and perhaps of giving him the Imperial crown, together with the knowledge, which had already become current, of the dealings of the Pope, forced Carloman to a speedy decision. Pestilence, however, which had already broken out

[1] Ep. 73. *Cum dicis nobis, Tuae nobilitatis, vel—monemus nobilitatem vestram.*

[2] Ep. 68. The sequence of these letters is incorrect. I place Ep. 68 after Ep. 73. It is there said: *sed etiam innumeris et supra modum gravibus oppressionibus quae nobis una cum dominico grege—ab adversariis illatae sunt, et quotidie inferuntur, in gremio sedis apost. quae caput est orbis et omnium mater fidelium, quiete ac securiter manere nobis minime licet.* He calls Rome *civitas sacerdotalis et regia*: imperial in the same sense as Byzantium, since it did not stand under the King of Italy.

in his army, attacked him, condemned him to inactivity in Bavaria, and prevented his advance on Rome. But the Duke of Spoleto and the banished Romans only awaited his signal to seize the Pope. In February or March 878, Lambert suddenly appeared before Rome. With him was Adalbert, Margrave of Tuscany, the son of Count Boniface and husband of his sister Rothilda, and in their train were many of the Roman exiles. Without betraying any hostile intention, Lambert, in the name of Carloman, desired to speak with the Pope, and John was forced to receive him in the palace by S. Peter's. The Spoletans meanwhile occupied the Leonine City, and placed a guard at S. Peter's gate to prevent the entrance of the Romans. The Pope thus found himself a prisoner. While the soldiers, in order to terrify him, committed acts of violence, Lambert demanded the assurance of Carloman's election, to which he compelled the Roman nobles to give their sworn consent.[1] But John would neither be forced to give this promise nor to consent to the restoration of the exiles. He was therefore detained for thirty days under such strict arrest that he complained it was only on urgent entreaty that Roman nobles and bishops, and his own servants, were admitted to his presence, and that he even

Duke Lambert attacks Rome, 878.

John VIII., imprisoned in the Vatican.

[1] This alone can be the meaning of the oath of fidelity. *Lantbertus, Witonis fil., et Adalbertus Bonifacii fil. Romam cum manu valida ingressi sunt, et Johanne Rom. pont. sub custodia retento, Optimates Romanor. fidelitatem Karlomanno sacramento firmare coegerunt. Annal. Fuld., A.* 878.

suffered from want of food.[1] Lambert at length withdrew, threatening, however, to return. He had achieved nothing beyond adding fuel to the anger of the Pope, and hastening the latter's journey to France. On the retreat of the Spoletans, John returned to S. Peter's. He had the treasures of the Church removed to the Lateran, caused the high altar to be covered with sackcloth, and the basilica to be closed. He allowed no pilgrim to enter, and reduced everything to confusion. After he had written letters to the Kings of France and Germany, to the Archbishop of Milan, to Berengar and Engelberga, and after he had pronounced in S. Paul's the anathema against Lambert, should he again attack Rome, John quitted the city in April, took ship and fled to France.[2]

His flight to France.

[1] In Ep. 84 ad Joh. Archiep. Ravenn. he puts it thus: *cum immensa pop. multitudine Romam venit: nos autem illum quasi dilect. amicum apud b. Petrum—honorifice recepimus, sed ipse—munereque corruptus ingenti, contra nos insurgere non dubitavit. Nam portas civitatis Rom. violenter imoque fraudulenter cepit.* In Ep. 85 to Count Berengar: *ut nobis apud b. Petrum consistentib., nullam urbis Romae potestatem a piis imperatoribus b. Petro principi ap. ejusque vicariis traditam haberemus.* Ep. 86 to Engelberga. Ep. 87 to Ludovicus (Balbus). Ep. 88 to Lewis of Bavaria. Ep. 90 to King Charles: *ipsius b. Petri —Eccl.—armis* 30 *diebus circumdatam tenere non formidaverint.*

[2] Hincmar: *Eis horribiliter exconmunicatis Roma exiit:* and the Acts of Trecas, with their Explanatio in L. Richter. He himself writes in Ep. 84 to John of Ravenna, that he had threatened Lambert with the anathema in S. Paul's. This was the last consequence of excommunication. Aimoinus V. 37, or his continuator, relates that John had sailed *ferens secum preciosissimas reliquias, et cum Formoso episcopo Portuensi.* Muratori and others believe in the persecution of Formosus: this, however, is a mistake.

2. John at the Synod of Troyes—He favours Duke Boso—Accompanies him to Lombardy—Failure of his plans—Charles the Fat becomes King of Italy, and is crowned Emperor in Rome in 881—End of John VIII.—His ambitious Projects—His Character.

John VIII. arrived at Arles at Whitsuntide, was here received by Duke Boso and by him accompanied further on his way. At the beginning of September he met King Lewis at Troyes. On the 14th of the same month, in presence of the Council there assembled, he excommunicated Lambert and Adalbert, the proscribed Romans, and Bishop Formosus, who after protracted wanderings had found refuge with Hugo, Abbot of S. Germains, and had been cited to appear before the Council. The Pope here crowned the stammering Lewis, King of France, and afterwards negotiated with him regarding affairs in Italy. John's hopes, which were dashed by the incapacity of Lewis, were revived by the energy of an upstart. Boso, in possession of the ducal title in Lombardy, had previously been the brother-in-law of Charles the Bald, and was now the husband of Irmengard, sole heiress of the Emperor Lewis II., a princess whom (after having poisoned his first wife) he had wooed from political motives. He was also a man so powerful in the eyes of the Pope as to seem fitted to oppose Carloman in Italy. The astute John hoped to make the Duke the instrument of his designs. He therefore made a treaty with Boso; promised him his aid in acquiring the royal title

He crowned Lewis the Stammerer.

Forms an alliance with Boso

in Provence; held out hopes of the Imperial crown, pronounced him his adoptive son, and received in return the promise of Boso's active interference in Italy. We here perceive the labyrinth of political intrigue in which the Popes had become involved by their temporal position. John VIII., hot-blooded and revengeful to an almost unequalled degree, hurried on in blind passion. His enterprises foundered from the time that he first trod the soil of France, and he himself fell for ever from his high estate.

He remained nearly a year in France, and then, accompanied by Boso, returned to Italy.[1] In Pavia he sought to alienate the Lombards from Carloman; and since Engelberga had now become the mother-in-law of Boso, he was enabled to avail himself of her influence. The counts and bishops of Northern Italy, under the leadership of Berengar of Friuli and Anspert of Milan, were not, however, disposed to exchange their King Carloman for an adventurer. The Lombard bishops, more especially the proud Metropolitan of Milan, were still far from admitting the authority of the Pope. They regarded with suspicion his doings in their territories and opposed his course of action. Having failed to achieve anything, Boso returned to Provence, and John VIII., bitterly

Returns with him to Italy.

[1] *Assumpto Bosone comite—cum magna ambitione in Italiam rediit, et cum eo machinari studuit, quomodo regnum Italicum de potestate Carlmanni auferret, et ei tuendum committere potuisset. Annal. Fuld., A.* 878. In Ep. 125, he writes to King Lewis that Boso had brought him safely to Pavia. He addresses the King: *dilectissime fili, ac porphyretice rex.* The assumption of Sigonius and Baronius, that Lewis the Stammerer was made Emperor, is unhistorical.

He returns to Rome.

deceived, went back to Rome. If we read the Pope's letters we are forced to admire his diplomatic skill. He possessed a capacity for political finesse such as but few Popes have shared. In the midst of the most intricate complications, such as those occasioned by the dismemberment of the Empire, and the crowd of pretenders which the occasion called forth, he discerned every possible combination. He formed and dissolved alliances with easy hardihood. In fear of the Saracens, in the hope of recovering lost Bulgaria, and for the sake of a treaty with the Byzantines, he unhesitatingly recognised the condemned Photius as Patriarch and distinguished him by his praise. He set the judgment of his orthodox contemporaries and of future generations at defiance, esteeming political advantage of greater importance than the dogmatic subtleties of the '*filioque*,' and posterity has consequently showered denunciations on his name. He would perhaps have followed the example of some towns of Southern Italy and restored Rome, in name at least, to the Byzantine Empire, if such a restoration had been possible. The lamentable decadence of the Carolingian house formed, indeed, a glaring contrast to the splendid dynasty of the Macedonians, which, in Basil I., had in 867 ascended the Greek throne. If ever a time seemed favourable to make Italy again Byzantine, it was under the reign of this prince. But the state of disorder in which he found the Empire, and the dread of the Bulgarians and Saracens, prevented the execution of such a scheme. He contented himself with sarcasms directed against

the Roman Emperor in his letters. He took Bari and stretched out his hands towards Capua and Benevento, but he did not prevent heroic Syracuse falling into the hands of the Arabs; and his son Leo, the so-called Philosopher, could lament the overthrow of the illustrious city in effeminate Anacreontics.[1] Fall of Syracuse, May 21, 878.

On his return to Rome, which he found at peace, since Lambert stood in awe of Boso, John thought of coming to some permanent decision. He was now willing to forsake his adoptive son, now impelled by necessity he turned to Lewis of Germany, brother of the ailing Carloman, and beguiled him with the prospect of the Imperial crown.[2] He desired at least an Emperor who would be subservient to his will, and therefore arrogated to himself the right of disposing of the Italian crown according to his pleasure. Such were the effects of the policy of Nicholas I. which John unhesitatingly pursued. He summoned a Synod in Rome for the month of May, to which he invited the Archbishop of Milan. "Since Carloman," he wrote, "cannot uphold the kingdom on account of his serious illness, it is absolutely necessary that you come here at the time appointed, that we may all take counsel as to the election of another king. You cannot, however, elect one without our consent, for he whom we shall raise to the Imperium must first be

[1] These verses are lost, and only their title is known. Spicileg., *Roman.* iv. p. xxxix. We still possess the memorable letter of the monk Theodosius concerning the fall of Syracuse: *Epistola de Expugnat. Syracusarum.* Gaetani, *Vitae Sanctor. Siculor.*, t. ii.

[2] Ad Ludovicum Regem, Ep. 197: *quoniam—Deo favente Romanum sumpseritis imperium.*

called and elected by us."[1] The Milanese scorned the invitation and did not attend the Synod. The Pope therefore laid him under the ban.

Charles III., King of Italy, 879.

These endless stratagems of Papal diplomacy at length resulted in the three brothers, Carloman, Charles and Lewis, agreeing that Italy should be left to Charles; and in 879 Charles the Fat came with an army to Lombardy and assumed the crown of Italy in Pavia. Nothing remained to John but to give, although unwillingly, the Imperial crown to the German prince. This he did after long negotiations and a personal interview in Ravenna. His adoptive son Boso, who had set up in Arles as King of Provence, was consequently now declared a tyrant.[2] Charles the Fat was assured of realising his hopes. The votes of Italy and Rome were in his favour; the dangerous Empress Engelberga was removed from her convent at Brescia and sent to Germany. He now came to Rome in the beginning of 881, where, without contest or difficulty, he received the Imperial crown at the hands of the Pope.[3] But John's hopes

Emperor of the Romans, 881.

[1] Ep. 155.

[2] Ep. 216 and 249 ad Carol Regem. Lewis the Stammerer of France died in 879; Carloman of Germany in 880.

[3] Hincmar assumes Christmas 880. Baronius and Sigonius 881. Pagi attempts to prove that it was at Christmas 881, from Ep. Joh. 269 to the Emperor Charles, *dat. IV. Kal. April. Ind. XIV.* (881). But who can answer for the correctness of the date? Muratori observes that the coronation must have followed in January or February 881. See Campi (*Hist. Piac.* i. n. xx.): *data* 5 *Kal. Jan. A.* 881. *Ind.* 14 *A. vero regni D. Karoli Regis—in Italia* 2, consequently he was not Emperor at Christmas 880. On the other hand, Dipl. xix. from Pavia: *dat.* 5 *Id. April. A.* 881, *Ind.* 14, *anno vero imp. D. Karoli primo*; he was therefore Emperor in the beginning of April 881. The

of bringing about an expedition against the Saracens were shattered. The Emperor hated the political past of the Pope. He never raised his weak arm in his aid. Sunk in impotence, he left Rome to herself; not even once did he send his legates to the city, where he allowed his Imperial rights to fall completely into abeyance.

The restless John spent the remainder of his pontificate amid ever fresh grievances. These were not occasioned by the Saracens alone; his enemies in Rome and Spoleto also continued to harass the Church.[1] Lambert, indeed, released in the changing course of Papal policy from excommunication, had died; but Guido, his successor in the Duchy, pursued a no less violent course. He usurped property belonging to the Church, and in vain the imprisoned Papal tenants stretched out their mutilated arms for rescue to the Pope.[2] In vain John implored the Emperor to send his envoys to restore peace in Rome and the Duchy. His prayers were useless, and were directed now to the north, now to the south, where his ambitious schemes had been shattered, and where Naples, Amalfi, and the Saracens allowed him not a moment of repose until death finally released him from his

Death of John VIII., Dec. 15, 882.

dates of the diplomas are frequently wrong; thus, for example, in the diploma of Charles III. in Margarini (Bullar, *Cassin. II.*, n. xliii.) where February 886 is reckoned as the 7th year of the Imperial reign. The opinion that the coronation took place in February 881 is also held by Dümmler, ii. 180.

[1] The Pope's tearful entreaties for aid still rouse our sympathy: Ep. 269, where he sends to the Emperor *cum apostolica benedictione palmam per quam signum datur victoriae* (end of March 881). The custom of sending the *claves confessionis* had ceased.

[2] Ep. 293, 299.

troubled pontificate. He died on December 15, 882. If the solitary statement of a chronicler is to be trusted, poison had been administered to him by one of his relations; and poison working too slowly, his skull had been fractured by a hammer.[1]

John VIII. was the last of a series of distinguished Popes, since with him closes the short period of princely splendour to which the Papacy had risen after the foundation of the temporal state under the Carolingians. Like Nicholas I. he was filled with a high consciousness of the Papal power, but was totally absorbed in aims of temporal dominion. He drew the Papacy deep into the current of Italian politics. He brought the Empire at first into subjection, but immediately experienced the consequences of its enervation. Scarcely had he humbled the Imperial power when he conceived the thought of making the Italian kingdom dependent on himself, and above all desired to raise the Chair of Peter on the ruins of the Empire, so that he might rule as his vassals the bishops and princes of an Italy which should be centralised in a Roman theocracy. His ambitious projects, however, remained unfulfilled; neither the diplomatic genius of John VIII., nor the abilities of any other Pope were capable of overcoming the chaos which prevailed in Italy. The bishops of Lombardy, the feudal dukes, who had all risen to power with the fall of the Empire, the princes of Southern Italy, the Saracens, the German kings,

[1] *Annal. Fuld.*, pars. v. *A.* 883 (*Mon. Germ.* i.): *prius de propinquo suo veneno potatus, deinde—malleolo, dum usque in cerebro constabat, percussus expiravit.* For his Epitaph see Baronius, *A.* 882.

the rebellious Roman nobles, had all to be overcome at one and the same time, and the task of the subjugation of so many hostile forces proved beyond the powers of one solitary man. However we may judge the ambiguous, intriguing, sophistic, unscrupulous character of John VIII., he was at all events the son of his age and was driven to bay by the desperate condition of Italy. He was distinguished, however, by gifts of intellect and energy of will so rare, that his name shines with royal splendour in the temporal history of the Papacy between the times of Nicholas I. and Gregory VII. In an age when ecclesiastical virtues had become extinct, and when the question was one simply of steering with subtle skill amid a thousand contrary currents, John VIII., considered entirely apart from his priestly office, stands the higher for the contrast with the weakness of his successors on the Apostolic throne.

3. Marinus I., Pope—He restores Formosus — Overthrows Guido of Spoleto—Adrian III., Pope, 884—The Decrees falsely attributed to him—Stephen V., Pope—Custom of sacking the Patriarchium on the Death of a Pope—Luxury of the Bishops—Famine in Rome—Deposition and Death of Charles the Fat—End of the Carolingian Empire—Struggle between Berengar and Guido for the Crown—Guido restores the Frankish Empire, 891—Death of Stephen V.

Marinus I., Pope, 882–884.

The new Pope, Marinus I., was the bitter enemy of Photius, in relation to whose affairs he had thrice

visited Constantinople as Apostolic nuncio. The circumstances of Marinus's election are unknown to us, as are those of his short pontificate.[1] We gather, however, from his acts that he belonged to the German party opposed to John VIII., since he not only hastened to condemn Photius afresh, but also released Formosus from the oath which he had taken never to enter Rome, and restored the deposed bishop to his diocese. He had a friendly interview with the Emperor at Nonantula, where he succeeded in overthrowing the bitterest enemy of the State of the Church. Guido of Spoleto, accused of treasonable correspondence with the Greek Emperor, was deposed by Charles the Fat, who had ordered Count Berengar to advance against the duchy. The fugitive Guido turned to South Italy, where he hoped to gain the Saracens to his cause, while his friends prepared for rebellion. These dark occurrences show the increasing disunion which prevailed in Italy.

Adrian III. Pope, 884–885.

On the death of Marinus, in the beginning of the year 884, Adrian III., a Roman of Italian sympathies, belonging to the Via Lata, ascended the Papal chair. But neither of his election nor of the conditions then existing in Rome do we know anything whatever. Fragmentary notices of historians, however, lead us to suppose that tumults prevailed among the nobility within the city.[2] Two decrees attributed to Adrian

[1] The *Annal. Fuld.*, pars v., *A.* 882, say: *antea episcopus, contra statuta canonum subrogatus est.* He had been Bishop of Caere. He is occasionally erroneously spoken of as Martinus II.

[2] *Iste Adrianus cecavit Gregorium de Abentinum et Mariam superistanam nudam per totam Romam fusticavit: Benedict of Soracte, M. Germ.* v. 199; the *Annal. Fuld.* inform us, immediately after the

are of doubtful authenticity, although the weakening of the Imperial power at the time affords some evidence of their being genuine. The decrees themselves appear as the consequence of the principles promulgated by Nicholas I. and the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals. In these decrees Adrian commands that the elected Pope shall be ordained without the presence of the Imperial envoys, and further, that after the death of the childless Charles the Fat, an Italian prince should receive the Imperial crown.[1] The incapacity of Charles, the decay of the Carolingian house, and the disorders of Italy (now left to itself) naturally favoured the hopes of the Italian dukes, more especially those of Berengar and Guido. As early as the year 884, Guido had obtained pardon of the Emperor in Pavia, and had been reinstated in his dukedom. In the beginning of the following year, Charles the Fat returned to Germany to hold a Diet, with regard to the Imperial succession, at Worms. Thither he invited Adrian, and, having consigned the defence of the city to the hands of John, Bishop of Pavia, as Imperial Missus, the Pope set forth. He died, however, on the journey at the Villa Vilczachare, or S. Cesario, near Modena, in the summer of 885, and was buried in the celebrated convent of Nonantula.[2]

election of Marinus, that the rich Superista Gregory was murdered by his colleague in the "paradise" of S. Peter's.

[1] Baronius is silent concerning this *decretum de ordinando Pontifice sine praesentia Legator. Imperial.* Sigonius (*De Regno ad A.* 883), carried away by Italian patriotism, upholds both decrees. No chronicler earlier than the untrustworthy Martinus Polonus is acquainted with them.

[2] *Annal. Fuld.*, and *Vita Stephani V.*, n. 642: *defuncto—Hadriano*

The Romans immediately proceeded to the election and consecration of his successor. The fact that they took no account of the Imperial right of ratification supports the belief that Adrian III. had promulgated the decree; but the indignation of the Emperor at the oversight shows that he had in no wise renounced the right. For no sooner did the news of the ordination reach him than he sent the Chancellor Liutward and some bishops to the city to depose Stephen. He was, however, appeased by the speedy arrival of Papal legates, who proved from documents that the new Pope had been formally elected. The Emperor now confirmed the election, which, nevertheless, had been the entirely free and independent act of the Romans.[1]

Stephen V., Pope, 885–891.

Stephen V., previously Cardinal of the Quattro Coronati, was a Roman of noble birth, son of Adrian of the Via Lata, at this time, apparently, the aristocratic quarter of the city. Stephen was unanimously elected in presence of the Imperial Missus (who had been detained in the city by his predecessor) and conducted to the Lateran. He found the treasure chambers of the palace completely empty. The custom had long since arisen that, on the death of a pope, his servants and the populace should fall on the apartments of the dead and plunder, not his private rooms alone, but the entire palace, and should

Papa—super fluvium Scultinna, in Villa, quae Viulezachara nuncupatur.

[1] *Unde imperator iratus, quod eo inconsulto ullum ordinare praesumpserunt, misit Liutwartum et quosdam Romanae sedis episcopos, qui eum deponerent, &c. Annal. Fuld.*

carry off everything that came to hand—gold, silver, costly stuffs and precious stones. The curious condition of anarchy into which Rome was thrown on the death of each pope in succession gave occasion to excesses such as these. The decease of the ruler invariably called forth extravagant joy among the people. The ship of Peter had been stranded, the cargo left ownerless to be the prey of the public. The like happened on the death of bishops, whether in the city or country; the episcopal dwellings were sacked in the same way.[1] The princely splendour with which the bishops were surrounded was undoubtedly at open variance with the principles of Christianity. These prelates lived in sumptuous dwellings, resplendent in gold, purple and velvet. They dined like princes on vessels of gold. They sipped their wine out of costly goblets or drinking horns. Their basilicas were smothered in dust, but their ample obbae or wine vessels were resplendent with paintings. As at the banquet of Trimalchio, their senses were gratified with the spectacle of beautiful dancing girls and the "symphonies" of musicians. They slept on silken pillows, in the arms of their paramours, on beds artistically inlaid with gold, leaving their vassals, coloni and slaves to look after the requirements of their court. They

Luxury of the Clergy.

[1] The Roman Council of 904 forbade this plundering—*quia scelestissima etiam consuetudo inolevit, ut obeunte—pontifice, ipsum patriarchium depraedari soleat, et non solum in ipso—sed etiam per totam civitatem, et suburbana ejus talis bacchatur praesumptio: nec non quia et id inultum hactenus neglectum est, adeo ut omnes episcopi eadem patiantur uniuscujusque ecclesiae obeunte pontifice: quod ne ulterius praesumatur omnimodis interdicimus.* Labbé, xi. p. 700.

played at dice, hunted and shot with the bow. After celebrating mass, they left the altar with spurs on their feet, a dagger at their side, and mounted their horses, which were saddled Saxon fashion and furnished with gilt bridles, to fly their falcons. They travelled surrounded by swarms of parasites, and drove in luxurious carriages which no king would have scorned to possess.[1]

Stephen, accompanied by the bishops and Roman nobles, his witnesses, wandered through the empty rooms of the Vestiarium. He consoled himself with the sight of one ancient and celebrated votive gift which had escaped the attention of the crowd. This was the golden cross which the great Belisarius had presented to S. Peter's as a memorial of his victory over the Goths.[2] The treasury, however, was empty. After his ordination, the Pope, according to custom, was obliged to bestow gifts in money, or presbyteria, on the clergy, the convents and the schools. He was also obliged to distribute meat and bread to the poor. The Lateran larders had been emptied, and Stephen was therefore now forced to satisfy the hungry claimants for his bounty from the resources of his own purse. Thus it came to pass that the death of a pope was followed by a two-fold festival in

[1] Such is the description given by Ratherius of the Italian bishops in saec. x. Praeloquoir, v. 6, p. 143, edit. Ballerini, *Ratherius von Verona und das* 10 *Jahrhundert*, by Albrecht Vogel. Jena, 1854.

[2] *Crux tamen aurea illa famosissima quam Belisarius Patricius ad honorem b. Principis Petri Ap. instituit, et plurimae sacratissimorum altarium aureae vestes, cum reliquis pretiosis ornamentis non defuerunt. Vita Steph. V.*, n. 643, the last Vita in the *Lib. Pont.*

Rome—the sack of the palace of the dead, and the bounties of his successor.

Meanwhile the Saracens advanced from their camp on the Garigliano far into Latium and Etruria. Stephen, like John VIII., demanded help from the Emperors of the East and West, and received it from Guido of Spoleto. The overthrow of the Carolingian house was near; the fall of the Emperor, who was despised throughout the provinces, was already prepared; and Guido, the neighbour of Rome, was the most powerful man of the moment. The Pope, who, perhaps, held out expectations of the Imperial crown, prevailed on Guido to take the field against the Saracens. A victory on the Liris gave Rome an interval of rest. In November 887 the Germans deposed Charles the Fat at the Diet of Tribur and elected Arnulf, the valiant son of Carloman, their king. Upon the death of the wretched Charles in 888, the Italians found themselves without either emperor or king, while the ambitious dukes disputed among themselves the crown of Charles the Great.

Charles the Fat deposed, 887.

The extinction of the legitimate line of the Carolingians in Germany (in France, the child Charles the Simple, son of Lewis the Stammerer, continued the unfortunate line) summoned pretenders from every quarter. Since there was no longer any hereditary claimant, the people again resumed the right of election, or rather the powerful bishops and barons of the ancient Empire occupied the thrones. Odo, Count of Paris, had set himself up as king in France. Provence, or the territory of Arles, had become the kingdom of Boso and his son Lewis. Count Rudolf

seized the crown of Burgundy; the bastard Arnulf wore the regal mantle in Germany. In Italy the question whether the Crown of the Lombards and the Empire of the Romans should fall to Berengar or Guido II. was left to the decision of arms.

The utterly divided country, from which tyrants now arose in swarms, found itself called, by its necessities, to shake off once for all foreign influence, to set aside the Empire and to form a united kingdom. The task was one that demanded a great intellect, and no great intellect was forthcoming, or was anywhere to be found. Had either Nicholas I. or John VIII. been alive, he would probably have endeavoured to establish an Italian theocracy, with Rome for its centre. Stephen was weak, and the superior power of innumerable vassals—now become independent—would have crippled the genius of even those audacious Popes. Nowhere was there a single Italian prince of true Latin descent in whom hope could be placed. The powerful dukes were one and all of German race. The difficulty, therefore, resolved itself into the question whether either of the two most powerful rulers in Italy had force and fortune sufficient to overcome his rival and opponent and convert him into his vassal.

Berengar and Guido contend for the Imperial Crown.

Illustrious Frankish descent gave the Friulian Margrave Berengar the greater prominence. He was the son of Gisela, daughter of Lewis the Pious, who had married Count Eberhard. Guido, who ruled Spoleto and Camerino,[1] had on the other hand pro-

[1] The family of Guido was descended from Austrasian nobles; his

fited by the state of confusion in Southern Italy to acquire territory and vassals, and his nearness to Rome and the enforced friendship of the Pope gave him an advantage over Berengar. His designs on France, however, where a party under the leadership of his powerful relation Fulco, Archbishop of Rheims, had proclaimed him king, hindered his success in Italy. He hastened to France, and while he snatched at a shadow, he allowed the reality to slip from his grasp. Berengar was quietly crowned at Pavia as King of the Lombards in the beginning of the year 888. Guido returned from France with the empty title of king, and in his indignation turned to make war on Berengar. After two fierce battles he remained victor and took the Lombard crown at Pavia in 889.[1]

The Frankish Empire, nevertheless, remained an inextinguishable tradition. It was restored by Guido in its ancient significance, although the idea of taking the so-called national aspirations into account never crossed his mind. The consciousness of Italian nationality was at this time very weak. While there existed a Lombard, a Spoletan, a Tuscan party, all of which in a certain sense may be called national, there

ancestor was Count Ludwin, Bishop of Treves. Dümmler, ii. 18. Berengar's grandfather was Unruoch; his father Eberhard had received the March of Friuli from the Emperor Lewis.

[1] *Widonis Regis Electio* (*Mon. Hist. Patriae*, Turin, i. 76; *Mon. Germ.*, iii. 554). Concerning Guido's struggles with Berengar, see the not very valuable *Panegyricus Bengarii Imper. Mon. Germ.*, iv. 190, Regino and Erchempert. According to the *Catalogi Regum et Imper.* (*Mon. Germ.*, v. 218) the quarrel broke out *dum regnasset* (*Bereng.*) *a. I.* According to Flodoard (*Hist. Eccl. Remens.*, IV. c. i. p. 576), Stephen adopted Guido before he was king.

was no Italian nation in any political or social sense. All the elements necessary to such a nation, common interests, language, literature and political unity, were entirely absent. In Rome the Papacy, the greatest power in Italy, in virtue of its cosmopolitan principle, was set above nationality, and in the North, as in the South of the peninsula, all the bishops, dukes and counts were Franks or Lombards, or here and there even Greeks. Nevertheless, on February 21, 891, Guido received the crown in S. Peter's, and, although a vassal of the Carolingians, boldly called himself Augustus, the great and peace-giving Emperor, and signed his decrees, according to custom, with the date of the Post-consulate.[1] Thus after long centuries was the Imperium again bestowed by the Italians on a prince, who, if not of Latin descent, was at least a native of their country. Whether it would remain with the Italians, and whether Guido was capable of founding a new dynasty, must now have been the all-important questions of the time.

Guido, Emperor Feb. 21, 891.

Stephen, who set the crown on the head of his adoptive son, must in so doing have admitted to himself that the policy of many of his predecessors was attained. The Imperial majesty had become incon-

[1] The diplomas in Ughelli, Sigonius and Muratori render the date indisputable. Muratori's Diss. xxx. and xxxiv. The first diploma of Guido has: 9 *Kal. Martii, Ind. IX. A. Incarn. Dom.* 891. *Regnante Domno Widone in Italia. Ann. Regni ejus III. Imperii illius die prima. Actum Roma.* One side of the leaden seal displays his portrait, with shield and lance; the other, the words RENOVATIO REGNI FRANC. (Murat., *Ant.* ii. 871); whence it appears that Guido never contemplated a national-Italian Empire.

venient alike to the Popes, the Romans and the Italians. It had sunk to a shadow. The highest dignity which rested on the power and greatness of the Empire founded by Charles, adorned the insignificant person of a duke who possessed some territories in Central Italy and received the title of the Caesars from the Pope.

Stephen V. died in September 891. Rome retains no monument of his reign, since the Church of the Apostles, which he entirely rebuilt, no longer preserves its ancient form. This basilica, which was the parish church of his noble family, and stood in the immediate neighbourhood of his father's palace, was the special object of his favour.[1]

[1] *Vita Steph. V.*, n. 648, 650. *Ecclesiam, quae ad Apostolos dicitur—fundamentis renovavit;* it still bore the title *Jacobi et Philippi* also. The life of Stephen enumerates some votive gifts; we still read of Canthara, Regna, Vela, of prases, jacinths and of white gems.

CHAPTER VII.

1. FORMOSUS, POPE, 891—THE FACTIONS OF ARNULF AND GUIDO—THE RIVAL CANDIDATE SERGIUS—FORMOSUS SUMMONS ARNULF TO MARCH ON ROME—ARNULF IN ITALY—DEATH OF GUIDO—LAMBERT EMPEROR—ARNULF ADVANCES AGAINST ROME—TAKES THE CITY BY STORM—IS CROWNED EMPEROR, APRIL 896—THE ROMANS TAKE THE OATH OF FIDELITY—HIS DISASTROUS RETURN—DEATH OF FORMOSUS IN MAY 896.

Formosus, Pope, 891–896.

FORMOSUS, Cardinal-bishop of Portus, ascended S. Peter's Chair in September 891. This ambitious man, whose significant past is already known to us,[1] was, as it appears, a Roman by descent. Excommunicated by John VIII., he had sworn never to return to Rome or his bishopric, but had been released from his oath by Marinus and reinstated at Portus. He lived in quiet under the pontificate of two Popes until, upon the death of Stephen V.,

[1] The Catalog. Rom. Pontif. in Eccard (*Corp. Hist. Med.*, Aevi II. n. 11), compiled soon after 1048, says: *Formosus. nat. Portuensis.* On the other hand, Watterich, i. 30: *Ep. Portuensis ex patre Leone.* The Annal. S. Columbae Senon. (*Mon. Germ.*, i. 103) call him *civis urbis Romae*, and this is also indicated by the *Invectiva in Romam pro Formoso Papa* (p. lxx). He cannot have been reinstated in Portus before 883; a diploma of Marinus of 882 being signed *per man. Valentini eccl. Portuens. Ep.* (Labbé, xi., in Marino).

he was, like Marinus, summoned directly from his bishopric to the Papal chair. Promotion such as this was at this time reckoned uncanonical.[1] Formosus had undoubtedly aspired to the tiara, and, in order to attain it, appears to have made promises to the national party, and thus to have acquired their votes.

His party meanwhile assembled under the banner of Arnulf of Germany and his protegé Berengar; their opponents under the Spoletan flag of Guido, of his son Lambert and of Adalbert of Tuscany. Into these opposing factions the two former parties of Franks and Germans in Rome were now transformed. The Spoletan faction was headed by the Deacon Sergius, an illustrious Roman, formerly rival candidate to Formosus and now his most determined opponent.[2]

The Pope, whose hopes had been fixed on Arnulf, found himself forced by circumstances to acknowledge the Emperor Guido, who, with the aim of securing the imperial dignity in his family, associated, apparently with the Pope's consent, Lambert, his youthful son, as co-regent with himself in 892. Formosus himself placed the crown on Lambert's head in Ravenna in

Lambert, co-Regent, 892.

[1] The *Invectiva in Romam* (Bianchini, *Anast. IV.* lxx., recently edited by Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii*, p. 137 *ff.*) says Formosus had been raised to the Papal chair by violent means.

[2] *Chron. Farf.*, p. 415: *huic quidam Sergius R. E. Diaconus erat contrarius.* Liutprand (*Antapodosis*, i. c. 30), who confuses the dates, asserts that, after the ordination of Formosus, Sergius, who had been his antipope, fled to Tuscany; *quatenus Adelberti, potentissimi marchionis, auxilio juvaretur: quod et factum est.* Formosus sought to reconcile his opponent by making him Bishop of Caere. We owe this information to Auxilius in *defens. Formosi*; see Dümmler, Auxil. and Vulgarius, p. 95; nevertheless, the fact remains doubtful.

892.[1] The act must, however, have been performed unwillingly, since it was impossible that any Pope could sincerely desire the establishment or confirmation of a native Imperial dynasty in Italy. The fortune of war favoured Guido; and in vain the defeated Berengar sought refuge with Arnulf of Germany. His cause was supported by envoys of Formosus, who was himself at the time sore harassed by the Spoletan party and by Guido, who had violated the frontier of the ecclesiastical State, and had confiscated patrimonies belonging to S. Peter. The struggle between the two factions in Rome threatened an outbreak; Formosus summoned Arnulf across the Alps in 893, and in the beginning of the following year the King came to Italy.[2] Milan and Pavia, terror-stricken, opened their gates; even the Margraves of Tuscany, Adalbert and his brother Boniface, surrendered themselves as vassals. Nevertheless at Easter, without continuing his victorious progress

Arnulf comes to Italy, 894.

[1] The year but not the day of Lambert's coronation is established. Muratori, *A.* 892, and Dissert., 34, believes it to have been the very beginning of March 892; Böhmer, Feb. 1; Dümmler, the end of April. To the Diplomas already known I add one from the *Cod. Dipl. Amiatinus* (Sessoriana in Rome, ccxiii. 163) of the year 893, Ind. xi.: *Wido et Lantbertus filio ejus magni Imp. Aug. anni Imp. eorum secundo et tertio m. Junio intrante die* 3. Muratori and Fumagalli believe that Lambert had been already crowned in Rome in 892; but, according to Regino, the ceremony did not take place until after his father's death: *Romam veniens, dyadema imperii—sibi imponi fecit.* Marian. Scotus gives the same account. The two coins of Formosus, given in Vignoli and Promis, have VVIDO *Imp.* and the monogram ROMA. Denarii of Formosus with Arnulf's title are unknown.

[2] *Contin. Annal. Fuld.*, *A.* 893—*ad A.* 894, follows the account of the first expedition.

through Guido's territory to Rome, whither he had been invited by the Pope, Arnulf returned to Germany.

Circumstances in Rome were not materially altered by the sudden death of Guido. This Emperor, or the tyrant of Italy, as German chroniclers call him, died in consequence of a hemorrhage on the banks of the river Taro, in North Italy, at the end of the year 894. Lambert apparently hastened to Rome, forthwith to be confirmed in the Imperial dignity, and to be solemnly crowned by Formosus. He was still very young, of attractive aspect and chivalrous nature, and in him the national party among the Italians centred their strongest hopes. The Pope, unsupported by Germany, accommodated himself to circumstances. He declared himself ready to protect Lambert with a father's care, but at the same time sent envoys to Arnulf urgently inviting him to Rome.[1] This act, betraying them as it did to Germany, must have roused the utmost indignation of the Spoletan party against Formosus. Arnulf left Bavaria in the autumn of 895, to remove Berengar as well as Lambert, and finally to seize both the kingdom of Italy and the Empire for himself. His warlike progress is the first in the list of the ominous descents of German kings on Rome. He divided his army as soon as he crossed the Po; the Swabians were directed to march to Florence by Bologna; Arnulf himself led the Franks

Death of Guido, 894.

Arnulf's march to Rome, 896.

[1] Liutpr. (*Antapod.*, c. 37) calls Lambert *elegantem juvenem, adhuc ephoebum, nimisque bellicosum.* The attitude of Formosus is explained by Flodoard, *Hist. Eccl. Remens. IV.* c. 3: *de ipso Lantberto patris se curam habere, filiique carissimi loco eum diligere,* and also c. 5. p. 610 (Edition of 1617). For the embassy to Arnulf, see *Cont. Annal. Fuld.* 895.

westward to Lucca. The report of the hostile intentions of Berengar and Adalbert of Tuscany hastened his progress, and after having celebrated Christmas at Lucca he marched against Rome. The boyish Lambert offered no resistance, merely seeking to defend Spoleto. But his resolute mother Agildruda, the daughter of Duke Adelchis of Benevento (celebrated through the imprisonment which the Emperor Lewis had endured at his hands) endeavoured to drive back the enemy from before the walls of Rome. Within the city a violent revolt had already broken out. The Spoletan or national faction, headed by Sergius and by two nobles, Constantine and Stephen, had already seized the Pope. Spoletans and Tuscans had entered, had barred the gates, barricaded the Leonine city, and filled it with armed men. And of all these warlike preparations a brave woman was the soul.

Rome for the first time was to be besieged by the troops of a German king, by "barbarians" of Germany. For the first time were these barbarians to conquer the sacred city and with it the Imperial crown by the force of arms.

He besieges Rome.

Arnulf encamped before the gate of S. Pancrazio in the month of February. He summoned the city to surrender, but was answered with disdain.[1] The

[1] *Annal. Fuld.*, *A.* 896, and the confused statements of Liutprand. Arnulf addresses the army, who can scarcely have understood his pompous reminiscences. Pompey and Julius were no longer in the city; the ancient Roman spirit had been removed by Constantine to Greece; and the Romans of those times understood nothing beyond catching fish in the Tiber:

His tota studium pingues captare siluros
Cannabe, non clipeos manibus gestare micantes.

Germans, at first irresolute and prepared for a fierce struggle, at length urgently demanded to be led to the attack. The walls were scaled with ladders, or by climbing them by means of saddles, piled one upon the other. Some of the gates were broken in by hatchets; the Porta S. Pancrazio by battering rams. The Germans entered the Leonine city on the evening of the first day, and released the Pope from the castle of S. Angelo, into which he had been thrown by his enemies.[1]

Takes it by Storm.

Arnulf had not accompanied his troops. According to Imperial custom he desired to make his entry from the Neronian Field, and to be received at S. Peter's with all due solemnity. The clergy, nobility and Scholae of Rome (among the Scholae, that of the Greeks is particularly mentioned by the German chroniclers) met him at the Ponte Molle and accompanied him through the Leonine city. The Pope received him according to traditional usage on the steps of S. Peter's, led him into the basilica, and, disclaiming Lambert, crowned him Emperor.[2] The day of the coronation, which is unknown, must have fallen in the latter part of February 896. The German bastard thus became Emperor, and the unpatriotic action of Formosus was never forgiven.[3] After

Is crowned Emperor by Formosus, Feb. 896.

[1] *Cont. Annal. Fuld.*, and Liutprand. The *Annal. Einsiedl.: Arnulfus cum concensu papae Romam vi cepit;* Regino bombastically and ignorantly calls this an event unrivalled since the time of Brennus.

[2] *Omnis ergo Senatus Romanor., vel Graecor. Scola—ad pontem Molvium venientes, regem honorifice—ad urbem perduxerunt: Annal. Fuld.*—Liutpr. c. 28: *in cujus ingressu, ulciscendo papae injuriam, multos Romanor. principes obviam sibi properantes decollare praecepit*, which, so far as concerns the day of entrance, is probably a fable.

[3] The coronation of Arnulf took place in February. The original

Arnulf had set in order various affairs concerning the city and the Imperial power, he received the homage of the Roman people in S. Paul's. The oath taken was as follows:—"I swear by all these mysteries of God, that, without prejudice to my honour, my law, or my fealty to the Lord and Pope Formosus, in all the days of my life, I am and will be faithful to the Emperor Arnulf; that I will never join with anyone in disloyalty to him; that never, for the attainment of worldly dignity, will I give aid to Lambert, son of Agildruda, or his mother; nor will I ever surrender to Lambert or to his mother Agildruda, or to any of their people, in any wise or manner, this city of Rome."

The Spoletan party had not opposed any great resistance to the victor. The Mausoleum of Hadrian, which soon afterwards became an important fortress, remains unnoticed by a syllable, although there is no doubt that Agildruda had placed a garrison within it. Immediately after the first attack on the city, the widow of the Emperor Guido had withdrawn to her own country with her troops, and the Romans, her allies, had laid down their arms. The indignation of Arnulf might have been soothed by the reflection that the taking of Rome, a city over which he possessed no right whatever, had cost him so little effort. We hear nothing of executions, but the two eminent

of his diploma for S. Sisto in Piacenza has the date *Kalend. Mar* (*tiarum*) *die anno incar. D. DCCCXCVI. ind. XVI. anno imperii ejus primo. Actum Rome* . . . Dümmler, *Gesta Berengarii*, p. 31, and the *Ostfränk. Gesch.*, ii. 677, of the same author. Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*, 2 Ed. p. 438, gives Feb. 22 as the day of the coronation.

Romans, Constantine and Stephen, were sent into exile in Bavaria as guilty of high treason. Arnulf remained only fifteen days in Rome. He appointed Farold, his vassal, governor of the city, and left for Spoleto, where the amazon Agildruda had made preparations for defence. A paralytic seizure attacked him on the way, the effect, more probably, of his own unbridled excesses and dissolute life than of poison administered by his enemy. A retreat, which resembled a flight, followed his brilliant victory; and the first warlike expedition of a German King to Rome left no permanent result.

Arnulf withdraws from Rome.

Death, whether through illness or poison, freed the Pope at the same time from the danger in which he must have been involved by the removal of his German defender, and the sudden turn of events consequent on a treaty between Lambert and Berengar. Formosus died on April 4, 896, after a reign of four years six months and two days.[1] No monument recalls this noteworthy Pope, although to him the city owed the complete restoration of S. Peter's and its mosaics, as well as the decoration of several other churches.[2]

[1] The day of his death is given only by *Cont. Annal. Fuld.*, and after it by Herm. Contract: *defunctus est die sancto paschae.* The Catalogue of Farfa gives him a reign of 5 years and 6 months. The earlier one of M. Casino (Cod. 353, of saec. x.) only 4 years 6 months and 2 days, which agrees with Cod. Vat. 1340.

[2] The monk of Soracte says in his praise: *renovavit ecclesia principis ap. Petri, pictura tota;* so too Amalr. Augerius (Murat. iii. p. ii. 313); the Invectiva in Romam: *ecclesias reaedificavit, exstruxit.*

2. Disorder in Rome—Boniface VI., Pope—Stephen VI., Pope—The Corpse Synod—Judgment pronounced upon Formosus—Fall of the Lateran Basilica—Causes of the shocking Sacrilege—The Libellus of Auxilius—The Invective against Rome—Terrible end of Stephen VI.

The death of Formosus was the signal for prolonged tumults in the city. The Tuscan and Spoletan factions seized all authority. S. Peter's Chair became the prey of the nobles, and was occupied by a series of Popes in such quick succession, that scarcely had they ascended it before they sank into a bloody grave. The Papacy, which under Nicholas, Adrian, and once more under John VIII., had risen to lofty aims, in the midst of the general political disruption sank to the lowest depths. A thousand spoilers laid hands on the ecclesiastical State; even the spiritual power of the Pope itself sank into little more than an empty title. Sinister darkness brooded over Rome, scarcely relieved by the doubtful glimmers which ancient chroniclers let fall upon this terrible period. A fearful scene is disclosed: violent barons calling themselves consuls or senators; rising from amongst them brutal or wretched Popes; beautiful, fierce and debauched women; shadowy Emperors who come, struggle and disappear—all pass before the sight in tumultuous haste.

Boniface VI., Pope, 896.

The Romans had placed Boniface VI. by force on S. Peter's Chair; fifteen days afterwards he

was dead.[1] The nobles of the Spoletan or national party hereupon elected Stephen VI., son of the Roman presbyter John, in his stead. Although the new Pope, out of fear, at first acknowledged Arnulf, no sooner had Arnulf left Italy and Lambert again entered Pavia than Stephen forsook the cause of the German. Incited by the enemies of Formosus, to whose party he himself belonged, in the hands of the followers of Lambert who ruled Rome, and seized by a gloomy access of party hatred, which assumed the character of actual insanity, Stephen disgraced the history of the Papacy by a scene of barbarity such as no other period has witnessed.

Stephen VI., Pope, 896–897.

It was ordained that a solemn trial of Formosus should be held, and the dead was summoned to appear in person before the tribunal of a Synod. It was February or March 897. The Emperor Lambert himself, with his mother, had come to Rome, where he now ruled as sovereign. The cardinals, bishops, and many other ecclesiastical dignitaries were assembled. The corpse of the Pope, taken from the grave where it had lain eight months, and clad in pontifical vestments, was placed upon a throne in the council chamber. The advocate of Pope Stephen arose, and, turning to the ghastly mummy, beside which a trembling deacon stood as counsel, brought forward the accusations; and the living Pope, in his insane fury, asked the

Post-mortem trial of Formosus, 897.

[1] *Qui podagrico morbo correptus, vix XV dies supervixisse reperitur: Cont. Annal. Fuld., A.* 896. His name has not been erased from the list of the Popes, although the Council of John IX. of 898 pronounced his election null. John VIII. had condemned him and deprived him of his orders.

dead: "Why hast thou in thy ambition usurped the Apostolic seat, thou who wast previously only Bishop of Portus?" The counsel of Formosus, if terror allowed him to speak, advanced no defence. The dead was judged and convicted; the Synod signed the act of his deposition, pronounced sentence of condemnation upon him, and decreed that all the clergy ordained by Formosus should be ordained anew.

The Papal vestments were torn from the mummy; the three fingers of the right hand, with which the Latins bestowed the benediction, were cut off: with barbarous shrieks the dead man was dragged from the hall through the streets, and amid the rush of the yelling rabble was thrown into the Tiber.[1] No flash from heaven, such as so often worked miracles in behalf of the Popes, struck this "Synod of horror." No martyr rose from his grave in indignation. But accident, which sometimes takes the place of Providence, ordained that precisely at this time the Lateran basilica, already tottering from age, should fall. Men were not wanting who, in the fall of the Head and Mother Church of Christendom, saw an omen of the downfall of the Papacy itself.[2]

Fall of the Lateran.

[1] *Annal. Fuld.*, Liutpr. (i. 30), gives a more circumstantial account of the proceedings, although he confuses Stephen with Sergius; the *Chron. Farf.* repeats his account. Chron. S. Bened. (*Mon. Germ.*, v. 204) says that the corpse had lain 11 months in the grave. The Invectiva: *cadaver jamque per 9 menses sepultum, per pedes de sepultura extraxisti—si interrogabatur, quid respondet? si responderet, omnis illa horrenda congregatio, timore perterrita—discederet.* Auxilii Libellus: *busta diruta, ossa fracta, uti quoddam memphiticum ejectus est extra publicum.* The Council of John IX. again depicts the scene.

[2] Baronius, *A.* 897, represents the fall of the Lateran as following the

With Cardinal Baronius, we may take refuge from this outrageous scene in the opinion that the Church cannot be disgraced by itself, because the Church, like the sun, is at times obscured by clouds, in order that it may afterwards shine the brighter. To the historian, however, who rejects metaphor, this Synod serves as evidence of the moral condition of the period. It serves to prove that the Popes, clergy, nobles, and people of Rome lived in a state of barbarism, than which nothing more shocking can be imagined. The savage hatred of the Romans condemned by Formosus, of a Sergius, a Benedict, or a Marinus (cardinal-presbyters); of a Leo, Paschalis and John (cardinal-deacons specially mentioned in the later council of John IX.); the thirst for revenge of the national party, roused to fury by the coronation of Arnulf, the first German Emperor, at the hands of the Pope who had deserted them; the political conditions accepted by Stephen VI., who was forced by stress of circumstances to flatter Lambert—such were the causes which led to the outrage. The hideous trial had adduced some juridical arguments from Canon Law: the previous condemnation of Bishop Formosus; his breaking of his oath, from which Marinus I. had, however, absolved him; lastly, his elevation to the pontificate from a bishopric. Decrees of ancient councils had forbidden the translation of bishops from one city to another. Other decrees had, however, pro-

Synod horrenda. The basilica fell in 897. The *Annal. Alamannici* (*Mon. Germ.*, i. 53) mention both events at the same time, but the fall of the Lateran first; *Bas. in Lateranis majori parte cecidit; et postea Stephanus—Formosum de sepulcro ejecit.*

nounced the step justifiable, if required by necessity, and with respect to Formosus, the Synod of John IX., in 898, decided in favour of the latter view, although it added that the uncanonical example was not to be imitated.[1]

Formosus, even at this time, found his defenders in some courageous men, namely, in the priests whom he had consecrated, and who protested against the injustice which pronounced their consecration invalid. Auxilius wrote a letter, in which he clothed with glory the unfortunate Pope; and another priest, whose name is unknown, directed a fiery invective against Rome, in which he blamed the entire city for the outrage for which the clergy were alone guilty. He recalls the fact that the Romans had always put their benefactors to death. Romulus and Remus, the founders of the city, had fallen, one by the hand of his brother, the other by the sword of rebels on the Quirinal. Of Peter and Paul (whom he might well have named the second founders of the city, and perhaps the idea of doing so may have occurred to his mind), one had been crucified, the other beheaded. In like manner the city had given vent to its rage against Formosus, a holy, an upright, and a Catholic man.[2]

[1] Canon iii. *Quia necessitatis causa de Portuensi ecclesia Formosus pro vitae merito ad ap. sedem provectus est, statuimus et omnino decernimus, ut id in exemplum nullus assumat.*

[2] The Invective, like the Council of 898, calls this Synod *horribilis*. The Libellus Auxilii is found, together with the other controversial writings, in vol. cxxix. of Migne's *Patrology*. See on this subject *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, vi. 122, &c. Dümmler (*Auxilius and Vulgarius*, Leipzig, 1866) has elucidated these writings of the party of Formosus, and has added to them others taken from a Bamberg MS.

Fate, however, overtook Stephen in the autumn of the same year, 897. His sacrilegious act had roused the friends of the Pope who had been outraged in his grave, as well as all right-minded Romans. The German party in the city took courage; the people rose, the guilty Stephen was seized, thrown into prison, and there strangled. Sergius, however, the bitter enemy of Formosus and the friend of Stephen, on ascending the Apostolic Chair a few years later, bestowed a monument on the latter Pope in S. Peter's. The inscription on this monument informs us of the fall and death of Stephen, and expresses hatred of Formosus.[1]

Stephen VI. is strangled, 897.

[1] Baron, *ad A.* 900. For the history of the Popes we are referred to the Catalogues and later compilations. The fragment περὶ τῶν παπῶν, from Formosus to John X. (Mai, *Spicileg. Roman.* v. 599), is for the most part merely a translation from Bernard Guidonis, whose *Flores Cronicor.* down to Gregory VII., have been edited by Mai in the same work. To the same period belong the wretched verses of Flodoard of Rheims, from the middle of saec. x., edited by Mabillon, afterwards by Muratori, *Script.* iii. ii. His account of Stephen's death is taken from the epitaph, which is as follows:—

Hoc Stephani Papae clauauntur membra locello:
Sextus dictus erat ordine quippe Patrum.
Hic primum repulit Formosi spurca superbi
Culmina qui invasit sedis Apostolicae.
Concilium instituit, praesidit Pastor et ipsi,
Leges satis fessis jure dedit famulis.
Cumque pater multum certaret dogmate sancto
Captus, et a sede pulsus, ad ima fuit.
Carceris interea vinclis constrictus et uno (imo ?)
Strangulatus nerbo, exuit et hominem.
Post decimumque regens sedem eum transtulit annum
Sergius hinc Papa, funera sacra colens.

3. Romanus, Pope—Theodorus II., Pope—Attempt of Sergius to seize the Papacy on the Death of Theodorus; he is banished—John IX., Pope, 898 — His Decree regarding the Papal Consecration — His Efforts to strengthen the Empire of Lambert — Death of Lambert — Berengar, King of Italy—The Hungarians in Italy—Lewis of Provence, Pretender—Death of John IX. in July 900.

Romanus and Theodore II., Popes, 897.

Romanus, a man of unknown origin, succeeded Stephen in the pontificate in September or October 897, but died four months later. His successor, Theodore II., designated the son of Photius, but a Roman, wore the tiara only twenty days.[1] Among the few actions recorded of the latter Pope, that of granting burial to the remains of Formosus redounds to his honour. Some fishermen of the Tiber one day recovered the corpse, and the remains of the man, who neither in life or death had found rest, were borne to S. Peter's. Pious observers related that the images of the saints in the chapel into which the remains were transported, bowed their heads in reverence at the sight.[2] Theodore also, by means of

[1] Flodoard; for Theodore he only gives a reign of 12 days. Cod. 353 of M. Casino assigns *m. III.* to Romanus (*Cod. Vat.* 1350, correctly *IV.*; Cod. 257 of M. Casino, *i.e.*, the *Catal. Petri Diaconi: m. III. a. XXII.*; and so too *Cod. Casin.* 185, of saec. xiv.), to Theodore *m. I. d. XV.*, *Cod. Vat.* 1340, *d. XX.*, and so too *Cod. Casin.* 275, Cod. 185, and the Catalogue which precedes the *Chronicle of Farfa*).

[2] Liutprand, c. 31. The name of Formosus has not since been borne by any Pope. In 1464 Pietro Barbo (Paul II.) wished to adopt it; the Cardinals, however, reminded him of the fate of the earlier Pope.

a synod, reinstated the clergy who had been ordained by Formosus. The party opposed to Stephen thus again returned to power under Theodore. The aristocrats of the rival faction, it is true, sought to snatch it after Theodore's early death, but their attempts proved unsuccessful. With the aid of the Margrave Adalbert of Tuscany, they had already put forward the powerful Cardinal Sergius as candidate for the Papacy. The party of Formosus, however, prevailed, and Sergius, driven with his followers from the city, again fled to his Tuscan exile.[1]

John IX., Pope, 898–900.

In circumstances, the details of which have not reached us, John IX. was ordained in the spring or summer of 898. He was a man of German descent, son of Rampoald of Tibur, a Benedictine and a cardinal-deacon. During his two years' reign he displayed intelligence and moderation. The profound silence into which the history of the city begins to sink is interrupted by two councils, the important decrees of which have been preserved. The shortness of their reigns had not allowed either Romanus or Theodore to purify the Church from the stain left upon it by the Corpse Synod. John IX., however, who had been ordained priest by Formosus,

He vindicates the memory of Formosus.

[1] The surest evidence of which is found in the epitaph of the later Sergius III. :—

Culmen apostolicae Sedis in jure paterno
Electus tenuit, ut Theodorus obit.
Pellitur Urbe pater, pervadit sacra Joannes,
Romuleosque greges dissipat ipse lupus.

See Baronius, taken from P. Mallius, as Pagi has shown, wrongly attributed *ad A.* 701, and to Sergius I. Flodoard made use of the epitaphs of the Popes for his verses.

assembled a council in S. Peter's. The bishops and presbyters who had signed the decrees of Stephen's synod were summoned; they asserted that they had been compelled by force to give their signatures to these acts. They threw themselves down before the Pope and besought his mercy. Pardon was granted, but the violators of the grave, the followers of Sergius, who stood ready armed in Tuscany, only waiting in their banishment for an opportunity to attack Rome, were again excommunicated. The acts of the Corpse Synod were condemned; and we read with surprise that it was thought necessary to prohibit trial of the dead for the future.[1] The memory of Formosus was triumphantly vindicated by the Synod, his election to the Papacy was confirmed, and his ordinations were recognised.

He attaches himself to the Emperor Lambert.

The tenth Canon of the same Council decided that the consecration of the newly elected Pope should henceforth only take place in the presence of Imperial legates. The scenes of bloodshed to which the election of John and those of his predecessors had given rise, demanded this recognition of the Imperial power, which had now become little more than a shadow. The friendly relations which existed between John IX. and Lambert had also some share in the edict.[2] The conditions which existed in Rome

[1] *Quia ad judicium vocari mortuus non potest—omnibus patet, quod mortui cadaver pro se non respondere nec satisfacere potest.* Canon I. Collection of Councils in Labbé and Mansi.

[2] *Quia S. R. Eccl. plurimas patitur violentias pontifice obeunte—quia absque imperatoris notitia, et suor. legator. praesentia. pontificis fit consecratio—volumus ut pontif. convenientib. episcopis et universo clero eligatur, expetente senatu et populo, qui ordinandus est, et sic in*

forced John to cling to the Empire, the power of which he sought to restore, since in its absence he foresaw the downfall of the Papacy. The circumstances which wrung his consent to this decree must indeed have been appalling. On the departure of Arnulf the youthful Lambert ruled unopposed in Italy. Safe from his rival Berengar, he hoped to govern the Empire in peace, and John sincerely strove to aid him in his object. At the same Synod in which he confirmed him as Emperor, the Pope flattered him and the Italians with the explanation that the ceremony of anointing the "barbarian" Arnulf by Formosus had been compulsory, and, as such, was to be considered null.[1] John's eyes were no longer turned towards Germany, where Arnulf languished on his death-bed, no longer towards distracted France; and the brilliant Lambert thus seemed to him the only safeguard of peace and security.

The same year 898 saw both men together at Ravenna, where the Pope held a synod of seventy-

conspectu omnium celeberrime electus ab omnib. praesentib. legatis imperatoris consecretur. Gratian, *Dist.* 63. *f.* 103. Adrian was said to have already acknowledged the *jus electionis rom. pont.* of the Patricius Charles. So says the account in the Cod. Vat. 1984, fol. 191: *Adrianus papa cum omni clero et poplo et universa sca synodo tradidit Karolo augusto omnem suum jus et potestatem eligendi pontificem et ordinandi apostolicam sedem.* A similar Edict was ascribed to Stephen IV., and with it was abrogated the questionable decree of Adrian III., of which, moreover, not the slightest mention is made in the Canon of John IX.

[1] Canon. vi. *Illam vero barbaricam Berengarii, quae per surreptionem extorta est, omnimodo abdicamus.* Since Berengar was not yet Emperor, we should, according to the suggestion of Sigonius and Pagi, read *Arnulfi.* Promis gives only two denarii of John IX. with the inscription LANTVERT IMP.

four bishops, memorable for some constitutions passed in regard to the Imperial power. It was ordained that no Roman should be prevented from appealing to the Imperial Majesty, or from demanding justice at his hands. Any person who prevented a Roman from appealing, or in this way injured his property, was declared amenable to the secular jurisdiction.[1] The Imperial tribunal was therefore to be restored as a protection to the weak against the usurpation of the nobles, and we may therefore reasonably infer that the Emperor again sent his Missus to Rome. At the same time the treaty which Guido had already concluded with the Church was renewed; the State of the Church, the Pope's rights of sovereignty within Rome and his own territory, were confirmed. Lambert promised to restore the illegally acquired patrimonies. He promised to support the Pope against the Roman exiles. The Pope at the same Synod lamented the terrible devastation suffered by the provinces, which he had witnessed on his way to Ravenna, and bewailed the fall of the Lateran basilica. He complained that his people, sent to procure beams to rebuild the basilica, had been hindered in their work by the rebels. He deplored the exhaustion of the ecclesiastical revenues, and the fact that not even sufficient funds remained to pay the clergy and the servants of the Papal Court, or to give alms to the

He restores the rights of the Emperor.

[1] Petitio Synodi, *Mon. Germ.*, iii. 563. *Si quis Romanus—sive de clero, sive de senatu, seu de quocumque ordine, gratis ad vestr. imperial. majestatem venire voluerit, aut necessitate compulsus ad vos voluerit proclamare, nullus eis contradicere praesumat, &c.*

poor. To such a degree of poverty had the Roman State sunk, and this, too, in so short a time; for only forty years had passed since Popes had supplied millions from their coffers for the building of new cities, on which, like Pompey or Hadrian, they had bestowed their own names.

The energetic Lambert had made a genuine peace with Rome, where he had gloriously restored the Imperial power. The Pope, though compelled by necessity, had with equal sincerity striven to secure Lambert in the Imperium. We look with ready sympathy on the efforts of both men to set in order the chaos of affairs in Italy. Freed from all foreign influence, it seemed now for the first time possible to form an independent kingdom within the Italian frontier. The interval of rest which the unhappy land enjoyed appeared to bear in it the security of a brighter future, and the youthful spirit of the Emperor was raised with lofty hopes. But an unfortunate accident suddenly ended this happy dream.

Death of Lambert, 898.

He had gone from Ravenna, following the upper course of the Po, to the plain of Marengo or Marincus, at that time covered with forest, and here remained spending his time in hunting. A fall from his horse shattered the hopes of Italy at a blow. The lamented youth, the handsomest and most chivalrous hero of the age, breathed his last on the field which, nine hundred years later, was to acquire celebrity as the scene of a great battle. Voices were heard attributing his death to the revenge of Hugo, whose father, Count Maginfred of Milan, had

been executed by Lambert. The supposition, however, rested merely on idle rumour.[1]

Berengar, King of Lombardy.

The sudden death of the young Emperor changed the entire aspect of affairs in Italy. Berengar immediately hastened from Verona to Pavia to seize the Lombard kingdom; and for a time fortune seemed to smile upon his hopes. For many of the nobles acknowledged him, and the death of the Emperor Arnulf in 899 freed him from the dread of any armed claim on the part of the Germans. Meanwhile, although secure of Adalbert's friendship, in spite of the fact that Lambert's afflicted mother, the widow of Guido, had entered into alliance with him, Berengar could not achieve his object. Guido and Lambert had each in a short space of time obtained the Imperial crown, and had quickly forfeited it by death; but Berengar, in spite of long years of toil, was never able to acquire it. Not even as king of Italy, when every circumstance seemed in his favour, when death had removed the claims of Arnulf and Lambert, was he allowed to grasp the fatal crown in Rome. This striking fact shows that in 899 the Hungarians had already made their first incursion into Italy, and that in the same year Lewis of Provence had appeared as a pretender.

The terrible hordes of Magyars forsook their

[1] Liutpr. (ii. c. 12) believes that he was murdered at Hugo's instigation; the *Panegyr. Berengarii* only knows of the fatal fall. The *Annal. Alemann.* and *Laubacenses* simply state his death in the year 898. Berengar reckoned the second year of his reign as early as Sept. 899; thus in the *Cod. Amiat.*, ccxiii. p. 167: *Regnante Domino Berinchari Rex post obitum Lanberto Imperatore in Italia A.* 2. *m. Sept. intrante die* 12. *Ind. II.*

Pannonian homes and recalled the days of Attila. They entered North Italy in August 899 and spread destruction along their way. By their arrows the army of the brave but unfortunate Berengar was defeated on the Brenta on September 24. The consequences of this defeat weighed heavy upon Italy.[1] The infamous game of Italian politics, which summoned now Germans, now French — always foreigners and always conquerors—into the divided country, was henceforth uninterrupted, and Lombardy, the loveliest plain in Europe, became the great battlefield of history—a field on which the Roman and German nations have fought until our own day for the possession of the Helen of modern times. The friends of Lambert, numerous even in Rome, the enemies of Berengar, among whom Adalbert of Tuscany was conspicuous, stood between him and the Imperial Crown. They turned their gaze towards the young king of Provence, the son of Boso and Irmengard, daughter of Lewis II. The grandson of a renowned Emperor of Carolingian race could justify his apparent claims to legitimacy, and reckon upon a large following among the nobles and bishops who grudged the succession to a native prince. Lewis came in the year 900, after the fatal

The Hungarians invade Lombardy, 899.

[1] This date seems to me certain. The Hungarians invaded Italy in August, Arnulf died in November. *Annal. Alamann. et Laubacen.*, 899: *Ungri Italiam ingressi. Arnolfus obiit.* So also *Annal. Augiens* and *Weingart.*, *Sangall. Minor.*, *Einsidlens.*, and even *Annal. Beneventani* and *Chron. Venetum.* The letter of the bishops of Bavaria to John IX., *A.* 899, also supports this date; for since it records the retreat of the Hungarians, if it was written before Sept. 900, the battle at the Brenta must have taken place in 899.

defeat of Berengar had removed the greatest hindrance from his path.[1]

Whether or not he had received an invitation from John IX. is uncertain. The friendly reception which he found in Rome from the Pope's successor shows, at least, the rapidity with which he won the people to his side. They had not forgotten that his father Boso had once given an asylum to John VIII., and that Boso had been consecrated King of Italy by John in opposition to Berengar and Arnulf. John IX. did not survive these events. Bewailing the destruction of his hopes, he died in July 900, after witnessing the close of the century of Charles the Great and the dawn of its successor. The tenth century, which had now begun, was destined, amid the terrible sufferings of Rome, to witness a revival of the Roman Imperium in the German nation. No monument in the city survives to recall the memory of John IX.[2]

[1] Although Liutprand speaks of a second coming of Lewis, his statements are very doubtful. According to Regino, the struggles between Berengar and Lewis took place as early as 898, and in the same breath the chronicler recounts the coronation of Lewis as emperor.

[2] That he restored or consecrated the Church of S. Valentine, we are informed by the inscription of the opifex Teubaldus, taken from the ruins, which tells us that he presented the Church with houses, manuscripts and vessels. It ends:

Tempore pontificis noni summique Johannis
Est sacrata die suppremo hec aula novembris
Dum quinta elabentem indictio curreret annum.

Given by Angelo Mai, *Scriptor. Veter. Vatican*, Collect. t. v. 218. The indiction does not accord with the time of John IX.

BOOK SIXTH.

HISTORY OF THE CITY IN THE TENTH CENTURY.

CHAPTER I.

1. Benedict IV. crowns Lewis of Provence Emperor, 901 — Leading Romans of the Time — Leo V. and Christophorus—Sergius III. becomes Pope—His Bulls — Rebuilds the Lateran Basilica — Anastasius III. and Lando.

If in the ninth century the history of the city itself is lost in the history of its Popes and Emperors, during the tenth the Romans themselves appear in person before us. With the fall of the Carolingian Empire and the Papal authority, the history of the mediaeval senate and the civic nobility begins to assert its independence.

While two princes contended for the possession of Italy in the north, Rome remained filled with the noise of party warfare. No Imperial arm any longer repressed the strife, and the Popes tumultuously ascended S. Peter's Chair to be hurriedly swept aside. The Roman, Benedict IV., son of Mammolus, obtained the tiara in May or June 900. His brief reign remains marked solely by the coronation of Lewis of Provence, who had come at the summons of the Italians. The son of Boso received the crown in Rome, at the beginning of February 901,[1] and some

Benedict IV., Pope, 900–903.

Lewis of Provence, Emperor, 901.

[1] The date is determined by a diploma of Lewis III. *in Laubia*

of the diplomas which he promulgated show that he actually exercised Imperial power in the city. A Roman placitum, of February 4, 901, has been preserved, in which the leading nobles are enumerated as his judges. These are, Stefanus, Theophylactus, Gregorius, Gratianus, Adrianus, Theodorus, Leo, Crescentius, Benedictus, Johannes and Anastasius. These men are all called Judices of the city, and doubtlessly all bore the title of consul and dux.[1] We shall frequently encounter the same men or their descendants, and may notice that amongst them not a single German name is to be found.

Leo V., Pope, 903.

Benedict IV., a mild and priestlike man, as Flodoard calls him, died in the summer of 903, and Leo V. from Ardea succeeded to the sacred chair.[2] A month later he was overthrown by Cardinal Christophorus. But a like fate was in store for the intruder: a few months later he too was thrust aside by Sergius and forced to retire to a monastery,

majore ipsius Palacii ann. Imp. Domni Ludovici primo, m. Febr. Ind. IV., in Fiorentini, *Memorie di Matilda*, &c., iii. 114. Lewis's diploma for Monte Amiata is dated June 1 of the same year. *Dat. Kal. Junii A.* 901 *Ind. IV. Anno vero Domni Hludovici gloriosi Imp. primo. actum Papie: Cod. Dipl. Amiat.*, ccxiii. p. 167.

[1] See the sentence in Mansi, xviii. 239. Peter, Bishop of Lucca, claims restitution from Lambert of Lucca, on account of some ecclesiastical property which he had appropriated.

[2] *Amalr. Auger.* allows Benedict a reign of 3 years and 2 months. The Catalogue of Monte Casino gives 3 years and 10 months. The *Cod. Vat.* 1340, 5 years and 5 months. That he died before July 26, is shown by Fantuzzi, i. 102. The chronology of the Popes, in the beginning of saec. x., is very doubtful. Joseph Duret (*Geschichtsbl. der Schweiz*, ii. 1856) and the editor of the second edition of Jaffé's *Regesta* have subjected it to a fresh criticism, without, however, coming to any definite conclusion.

where he disappears from history.[1] Thus, in a space of only eight years eight Popes had been elected and overthrown, a striking testimony to the horrors of civil war in Rome. Out of this state of chaos there gradually rose to the surface a few civic families, one of whom at length succeeded in seizing the reins of government.

Sergius, the son of Benedict, probably belonged to this family. His repeated promotions illustrate the period of aristocratic tyranny into which Rome entered at the beginning of the tenth century. We have already seen this ambitious cardinal as the opponent of John IX.; later in the exile (beginning in 899), in which he spent seven years of his life, his eyes incessantly turned towards the Papal throne, until he finally succeeded in obtaining it. Although we are informed that he was recalled from banishment and raised to S. Peter's Chair at the entreaty of the people, his elevation could only have been accomplished after he had overcome his opponents, and had expelled or put to death the hostile cardinals.[2] It is possible that

[1] With respect to these two Popes, Flodoard says:—

Post quem celsa subit Leo jura, notamine quintus:
Emigrat ante suum quam Luna bis impleat orbem.
Christophorus mox sortitus moderamina sedis,
Dimidio, ulteriusque parum, dispensat in anno.

The Catalogue of Monte Casino, 353 (compiled about the year 920), gives Leo one month's reign, Christophorus 6 months, which harmonise fairly well with Flodoard's statements. The Catalogues *Vat.* and *Eccardi* give 7 and 6 months. The date of Sergius's elevation would, it is true, allow of but 4 months at most, the time specified in the Catalogue of the *Chron. Bernoldi* and *Herm. Contr.*

[2] His epitaph is as follows:—

Exul erat patria septem volventibus annis.
Post populi multis Urbe redit precibus.

he may have come to Rome under the escort of troops belonging to Adalbert, the powerful Margrave of Tuscany. This, however, remains uncertain, and since Tuscan influence now disappears, and since Sergius retained the pontificate for seven years, it follows that the ruling faction of the nobility to which he belonged must have overcome their opponents. Sergius also maintained his own position while leaving the government of the city more or less in their hands. At the head of the Roman aristocracy stood Theophylact, whose influential wife Theodora was the friend and protectress of Sergius III.

Sergius III., 904-911.

Sergius became Pope in January 904.[1] He immediately condemned Formosus afresh and pronounced all his ordinations invalid. His predecessors in the Papacy, Leo and Christophorus, he allowed either to perish or be murdered in their cells.[2] This man of violence, seven years of whose life were spent in exile, seven in the Pontificate, behind whom stood the outraged remains of Formosus and the blood-stained shades of other Popes, the circumstances of whose reign are hid in mystery, compels us to regret the uncertainty in which this period must ever remain shrouded. Ecclesiastical historians, above all Baronius, have heaped denunciations on his memory, as on that of a monster. His share in the trial of Formosus, his forcible elevation, the intrigues with Marozia (a Roman and the daughter of Theodora), with which he is

[1] He was consecrated between January 25 and February 1, 904, as Jaffé, following Muratori (*Ant.*, v. 773), shows.

[2] *Duro domans ergastulo vitam eorum cruda macerationc decoxit—Eugenii Vulgarii de causa Formosiana libellus*, in Dümmler, p. 135.

credited by Liutprand, give ground for this opinion; although our estimate might be modified were the conditions of the time more clearly known. That Sergius, who remained Pope throughout the storms of seven years, was at least a man of energy must be admitted, although apostolic virtues are scarcely to be looked for in a character such as his. We read some of his documents with interest. A bull of 906 bestows several of the estates belonging to the Tuscan patrimony on the bishopric of Silva Candida, the population of which diocese had been almost annihilated by the Saracens. Another bull endowed Euphemia, the Abbess of the Convent Corsarum, with several estates, the property of this convent having likewise been destroyed by the infidels. A man like Sergius must indeed have considered himself in need of intercession when he ordered the nuns to sing daily one hundred Kyrie Eleisons for his soul.[1]

Were we in possession of the registers of the time, we should doubtless find that Sergius restored several of the Roman Churches. Documents prove that he rebuilt the Lateran. Tumults in Rome had prevented John IX. from restoring the honoured basilica of Constantine, and throughout the horrors of this dreadful time, it had lain for seven years a heap of ruins on the ground, ransacked by the Romans in search of the votive gifts which lay buried within.

Sergius III. rebuilds the Lateran.

[1] The first bull is given in Marini, n. 24. The second, n. 23, is derived from the archives of the nuns of S. Sisto (Via Appia), who were transplanted to S. Sisto e Domenico (Region Monti) under Pius V. Torrigius, *Hist. della vener. Imag. di M. Vergine nella chiesa de' SS. Sisto e Dom.*, Rome 1641, p. 36.

Valuable works of early Christian art and gifts of Constantine, in which the Lateran especially gloried, were then lost for ever. Here also the golden cross of Belisarius seems to have disappeared.[1] The Romans desired the restoration of this, the holiest of their temples. If, since Charles's coronation, the Cathedral of S. Peter had become the centre of all the relations between Rome and the political and dogmatic world, the meeting place of the greater number of Councils, the Lateran basilica, nevertheless, remained the treasury of relics, the image of Jerusalem, the Head and Mother Church of Christendom. The tranquillity maintained in the city under the reign of terror of Sergius's adherents allowed the Pope to rebuild the basilica. And to the memory of the great "Delinquent" redounds the honour of the restoration of a Church, which gradually became filled with the monuments of history, and which endured for nearly four hundred years until it was eventually destroyed by fire.

Sergius entirely rebuilt the basilica and endowed it with other votive gifts. It would appear that the foundations and proportions of the ancient Church were retained,[2] but that Sergius added the portico of

[1] Joh. Diacon.: *De Eccl. Lateran.* (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. 575): *in illis vero temporib., quib. invasores apostol. tenebant sedem, tulerant de hac bas. omnes thesauros, et cuncta ornamenta.* The same writer says of Sergius's building: *temp. autem illius* (Stephen VI.) *ruit, et fuit in ruinis dissipata et comminuta usque ad tempus, quo revocatus est dom. Sergius.* See also *Vita Sergii*, Catalogue in Watterich, i. 32, and *Chron. of Benedict*, c. 27.

[2] *Incipiens ab antiquis laborare fundamentis, finetenus opus hoc consummavit*, says Joh. Diacon.

ten columns and divided the interior into five aisles. The columns, partly of granite, partly of verde-antico, were ancient. The tribune was adorned with mosaics. A long inscription celebrated the building of the Pope, and verses to the same effect were placed over the principal doors.[1] The basilica, it is true, continued to bear the name of the Saviour. In his inscription, however, Sergius speaks of its patron as S. John the Baptist, who had formerly been appointed such by Constantine. Thus—and the fact is significant in Rome—the name of the Saviour began to fade from the principal church. The Lateran again stood erect, and, as a temple which had risen out of utter ruin, more than ever strengthened the reverence of the faithful. For two centuries after the time of Sergius III. it, instead of S. Peter's, served as the burial place of nearly all the Popes.

The building of a church is the sole historic monument of the age, all remaining events being wrapped in obscurity. The unfortunate Lewis, indeed, was called Emperor. He remained, however, merely a shadow or a name, and had vanished altogether from Italian history after the year 905. Berengar had attacked him in Verona, had put out his eyes, and

[1] See the inscription from the tribune in Rasponi (*De Basil et Patriarchio Lateran*, p. 28), of which the last lines are—

Spes dum nulla foret vestigia prisca recondi
Sergius ad culmen perduxit Tertius ima,
Cespite ornavit ingens haec moenia Papa.

The reading *pingens* is better. The inscription over the door is given by Joh. Diacon.:

Sergius ipse pius Papa hanc qui coepit ab imis
Tertius, exemplans istam quam conspicis aulam.

had sent him back to his home. But Berengar himself was prevented from acquiring the depreciated Imperial crown, less by the lawful rights of the blinded Lewis than by the confused state of the country, the continued struggles with the Hungarians, and lastly, by the aristocrats of the city, who no longer desired an Emperor.[1] Sergius III. died in the course of the year 911.[2] He was succeeded by the Roman Anastasius III., whose two years' pontificate, as also the little more than six months' reign of his successor Lando, are hid in utter darkness. Lando, the son of Raino, a Lombard count, who owned property in the Sabina, died in the spring of 914. A remarkable man now succeeded to the Papal throne, and filled it with no common energy for fourteen years.[3]

Anastasius III., 911–913.

Lando, 913–914.

[1] Neither the denarii of Sergius III. nor those of Anastasius III. are marked with Lewis's name, while coins of Benedict IV. bear the inscription: LVDOVICVS IMP. The two former Popes consequently did not recognise Lewis as Emperor.

[2] According to Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*, 2, Ed. by Löwenfeld, in June; according to Duret, on April 23 or May 24. Benedict of Soracte: *obiit Sergius P. nonas Kal. Majas*, c. 29.

[3] The *Catal. Casinen*, 353, closes with Joh. X., whose reign it does not register. It gives Anastasius *a. II. m. . . .* (*Cod. Casin.*, 257, *a. II. m. II.*, like *Cod. Vat.* 1340). Lando, *a. I.* (*Cod.* 257, *an. III. d. XXXIII. Cod. Vat.* 1340, *m. V. et cessavit ep. d.* 36). Benedict of Soracte gives him *m.* 6, and Flodoard *m.* 6 *dies* 10. The *Catalogue Eccardi* writes *Trano* instead of *Raino* (Rayner), as the *Catal. Vat.* correctly gives it. The celebrated *Catal. Vatic.*, 3764, from La Cava, which contains the *Lib. Pont.* and very ancient catalogues, says, on the contrary: *Lando nat. Sabinense ex patre taino sedit m. VII. dies XXXVI.*

2. JOHN X.—HIS PAST—HE OWES THE TIARA TO THE ROMAN THEODORA — THEOPHYLACT, HUSBAND OF THEODORA, CONSUL AND SENATOR OF THE ROMANS—THE UPSTART ALBERIC — HIS RELATIONS WITH MAROZIA—THEODORA AND MAROZIA.

The past of John X. is partly veiled in the darkness of suspicious rumours. These rumours, however, are derived from the accounts of the Lombard Liutprand, a man who was born during John's pontificate, and the value of whose statements is diminished by the frivolity of his character. Liutprand relates that the Archbishop of Ravenna had frequently sent his presbyter John to Rome on ecclesiastical affairs, and that the Ravennese here became the lover of Theodora, a noble Roman lady. A short time afterwards he rose to be bishop of Bologna, and on the death of the Metropolitan of Ravenna, succeeded to the vacant chair. Theodora, however, summoned him to Rome and caused him to be elected Pope.[1] According to tradition, John was born in Castel Tossignano near Imola, and in any case began his

[1] *Theodorae autem glycerii mens perversa, ne amasii sui ducentor. milliarium interpositione quib. Ravenna separatur Roma* (which is incorrect) *rarissimo concubito potiretur*, &c., Liutprand., *Antapod*, ii. c. 48. It was not Peter who was Archbishop of Ravenna, but more probably Kailo. Muratori has disputed Liutprand's trustworthiness; Köpke (*De Vita et Scriptis Liudprandi*, Berlin, 1842) defends him. Baronius, Mansi and Mittarelli have unhesitatingly accepted his strong expressions concerning John X., Theodora and Marozia. Duret (*Geschichtsbl. der Schweiz* i.) has exposed Liutprand's mistakes, and has been followed by F. Liverani, Giovanni da Tossignano; Macerata, 1859.

career in Bologna, where he was consecrated deacon by Bishop Peter. He succeeded Peter in the episcopal dignity, it is said, by violent means. Being an ambitious and adroit man he attained to the throne of Ravenna on the death of Archbishop Kailo, and filled it not ingloriously for the space of nine years before he became Pope.[1] In violation of the decree of council of John IX., he passed directly from a bishopric to S. Peter's Chair. The act, although uncanonical, was not accounted dishonourable, and were John actually the lover of a beautiful woman, a fact which cannot be completely proved, he was neither the first nor last Pope who enjoyed the like privilege. The ruling faction of the nobility, to which Theodora belonged, summoned John, and overcoming the resistance of the clergy and of his opponents invested him with the Papal crown. He owed the Apostolic chair to an influential woman, but the more immediate circumstances of the election are unknown to us.[2]

Theodora and Theophylact.

Theodora, a bold and beautiful Roman of unknown family, emerges suddenly out of the darkness of the time—a mysterious figure, ruling the city, as Liutprand says, with the vigour of an autocrat. She leads us to inquire into the causes by which a woman could

[1] The *Invectiva in Romam* relates that John usurped the bishopric of Bologna, and reviles him as a Lucifer. The Invective is a production of John's own time, and its words, in spite of being inspired by party hate, are not without weight.

[2] The *Invectiva*, Liutprand, Leo of Ostia, *Chron. S. Bened.*, call John X. *invasor et intrusus*. Martin. Polon., Andreas Dandolo, Bernard. Guidonis, confusing him with John XI., make him the son of Sergius III. *Amal. Augerius* also maintains, like Bernardus, that he had been banished from Ravenna by the people. Flodoard and the *Anon. Berengarii* take his part.

suddenly attain to such greatness. She was the wife of Theophylact, Papal Vestararius, Magister Militum, Consul and Dux, a man who belonged to the highest nobility, and who first appears in 901 among the Roman judges of Lewis III.[1]

His name, which, like that of his wife Theodora, is encountered wherever the Greeks ruled or had ruled in Italy, by no means proves that he was of Greek descent. Byzantine names had been common in Rome for centuries. In the tenth century they frequently occur in diplomas, and Dorothea, Stephania, Anastasia, Theodora are as common as Theodore, Anastasius, Demetrius; as Sergius, Stephen and Constantine. Such names were not only an echo of Byzantine times, but in the tenth century were prob-

[1] Mansi, xviii. p. 239. In 906 a Theophylact appears as Sacellarius (Marini, n. 24). The same man appears in 915 in the Placitum of Mont' Argenteum. In 927 *Theophyl., Cons. et Dux*, perhaps thus early the son of Theodora's husband (*Reg. Subl.*, fol. 97; *Cod. Sessor. of Fatteschi*, p. 45). In 939 a *Theophyl. nobili viro* (*ibid.* p. 65). In the judgment of Alberic II., in 942, the Vestiarius Theophylact appears among the Roman nobility. He and his wife Theodora Vesterarissa are mentioned on a gravestone from S. Maria Maggiore (Galletti, *Del Vestar.*, p. 46; A. Mai, *Script. vet.*, n. Coll. V, 215 n. 8), set up by them to their children, Sergia and Bonifacius; the inscription records that they had presented the Fundus Nzanus, in the territory of Nepi, to the church of S. Maria *pro animabus . . . filior. nostror.* In 949 Maroza *nob. fem. conjux vero Theophylacti eminent. Vestarario* (*Cod. Subl. Sessor.* 217). The respect enjoyed by Theophylact and his wife is shown by a remarkable letter, probably addressed to them by a Bishop of Ravenna, which bears the inscription: *Inclitae dignitatis gloria decorato Theofilacto gloriosissimo duci et magistro militum sacrique palatii vesterario et mi(nistro) et dominae Theodorae serenissimae vesteratrici salut. nostram sempiternam.* (From a *rotulus* discovered in the archives of Prince Antonio Pio of Savoy, by Count Porro, communicated by S. Löwenfeld, *Neues Archiv.* ix., 517.)

ably a sort of legitimist renascence or aristocratic fashion in Rome; a protest on the part of the nobility against the German Empire. They prove at the same time that the national feeling of the Romans was weak at the period. No Scipio, Caesar or Marius is heard of, and whenever Latin names appear, they are borrowed, like those of Benedict, Leo or Gregory, from the saints. As soon, however, as the city fell under the sway of a prince of the nobility, the name of Octavian, its first Emperor, immediately reappeared as the name of that prince's direct heir.[1]

Theophylact, Consul and Senator of the Romans.

Theophylact attained to great influence in the beginning of the tenth century. If in 901 his name only appears, together with the names of other nobles, as the second in their ranks, he must, nevertheless, have borne *par excellence* the title "Consul or Senator of the Romans" as early as the later times of Sergius III., or under the weak successors of that Pope. His wife Theodora possessed, moreover, an all-powerful influence over the Papacy and city.[2] In 915 his son was designated, not son of any

[1] John X., formerly Archbishop of Ravenna, may have been related to Theodora or Theophylact. On the existence of a noble Marozia of Ravenna (Fantuzzi, v. 160), I lay no weight, this diminutive of Maria being very common. Through Marozia, Theophylact became ancestor of the Tusculan family, which preserved his name. Liverani arbitrarily represents Theodora I. as the daughter of Adalbert I. of Tuscany. That Theophylact was her husband we know from Benedict of Soracte, c. 29.

[2] Dümmler (*Auxilius and Vulgarius*, p. 146) gives a letter of Vulgarius to this Theodora, taken from a Bamberg MS., in which the adherent of Formosus implores her protection, probably at the court of Sergius III. The inscription runs: *ad Theodoram* (two words are missing here) *Smae et deo amatae venerab. matronae Theodorae Vul-*

consul mentioned by name, but son of the Consul, and was, with the brother of the Pope, exalted above all other Romans.[1]

We have no proof of the supposition that the Romans at this time yearly elected consuls and placed them at the head of their municipal administration; the city, however, must have undergone an inward transformation since the fall of the Carolingian Empire. Its government had fallen into the hands of laymen (the *judices de militia*), the prelates (the *judices de clero*) having been repressed. The aristocracy, freed from the Imperial power, extorted greater privileges from the Pope, and appear as taking part in all political affairs. The ancient Senate seems already to be revived in this civic nobility, and the Patriciate — a traditionally important institution for temporal Rome — appears after the fall of the Empire, to have returned to the so-called consuls who had now become powerful, and whose families strove to appropriate the office and to render it hereditary. A "Consul of the Romans" was elected as Princeps of the nobility from its midst; was ratified by the Pope, and placed as a Patricius at the head of the jurisdiction and administration of the city. Besides the title of *Consul Romanorum*, this head of the aristocrats seems to have borne, at the

garius peccator vitam in Christo. It extols her piety: *Habes igitur virum* (mystically speaking Christ) *multo plus fortiorem et potentiorem isto senatore* (Theophylact): *iste etsi est dominus unius urbis* (Rome), *sed ille totius orbis.*

[1] *Alter Apostolici nam frater, consulis alter Natus erat.* So the Panegyr. of Berengar, and the ancient gloss on this author, says: *Consul Romanorum tum erat Theophylactus.*

same time, that also of *Senator Romanorum*.[1] In this capacity we encounter Theophylact; and the power of Theodora, "the Senatrix," as she called herself, can only be explained by the position occupied by her husband. She was at the same time the soul of the great family of nobles, and her daughters Marozia and Theodora inherited both her seductive charm and her powerful influence. It was already rumoured that Sergius III. had enjoyed the love of Marozia, and that the boy, who later became John XI., was the child of their intercourse. Marozia afterwards introduced an upstart into the family of Theophylact, by whom she became the mother of the first secular prince of Rome.[2]

First appearance of Alberic, 889.

This was Alberic, a stranger in the city, where no other bearer of his essentially German name had previously appeared.[3] We know nothing of his

[1] The Placitum of Mont' Argenteum, of the year 1014, cites a bull of John X. (915), and mentions first among the Roman nobility *Theophylactus Senatores Romanorum*, then Gratianus Dux, Sergius Primicerius, &c. The original parchment actually says *Senatores*; but since every dignitary had his epithet, we must read *Senator*. *Senatores* is merely an ungrammatical barbarism; Benedict of Soracte also says *Petrus marchiones*. Theophylact is there also represented as head of the aristocracy. He disappears after the year 915. His palace in Rome is heard of in later times.

[2] *Theodora, scortum impudens—Romanae civitatis non inviriliter monarchium obtinebat. Quae duas habuit natas., Marotiam atque Theodoram, sibi non solum coequales, verum etiam veneris exercitio promptiores.* Liutprand. *Antapodosis*, ii. c. 48.

[3] The error of confusing *Albericus Marchio* with *Albertus m.* has occasioned great perplexity, Tuscany being confounded at the same time with Tusculum. The Italians, who make Alberic a Roman, ought to produce a Roman bearing the name,—a name which was as

undoubtedly Lombard ancestors, who dwelt either in Spoletan or Tuscan territory, perhaps in Horta. He himself, however, makes his appearance as vassal under the banner of Guido in 889; a banner which he afterwards deserted to seek his fortune under the rising star of Berengar. His career resembles that of some of the condottiere (such as the ancestor of the Sforza family in Milan), of later times in Italy. He became Margrave, perhaps of Camerino, and as early as 897 bore the title of Marchio.[1] Whether or not he acquired possession of the dukedom of Spoleto by means of setting aside the last heir of the reigning house, is uncertain. No period could possibly have been more favourable to the rise of an audacious man than the period which gave birth to these factions, later destined to be perpetuated as the scourge of Italy. Alberic suddenly appears as

common in Lombardy as Adelbert, Hilderic, Albuin, Alifred, Bonipert (I believe the Bonapartes to be Lombards of this name). *Albericus fil. Adelfusi* (*Cod. Farf. Sessor.* 218, n. 319). Albericus, Missus of a Lombard judex (n. 324). Albericus, Scabinus, A.D. 897 (n. 342). A.D. 997, Albericus, Abbot of Farfa.

[1] That Alberic was an upstart and that he aimed at the lordship of Camerino, we learn from the *Paneg. Bereng.*, lib. ii:

Pauper adhuc Albricus abit, jam jamque resultat.
Spe Camerina. Utinam dives sine morte sodalis.

These lines hint at an entire history. The gloss to the poem says that he had slain Wido of Camerino. The Farfa documents (Fatteschi, n. 57) call him *Comes* about 900; *temporib. Alberici Comitis a. ejus IV. m. Martii Ind. III.*, Nos. 58, 59; the year 914 is reckoned as his 25th year. Scheid (*Origin. Guelf.*, i. lib. 2) believes that he had his residence in Horta. There were Marchiones de Orta even in the time of Otto III. (*ib.* p. 138); while, however, a Margravate of Horta is not known in the beginning of saec. x. Alberic may, however, have really been *Comes* of Horta.

one of Rome's most influential neighbours, and then as taking part in the affairs of the city. During the scenes of bloodshed, amid which Sergius III. rose to S. Peter's Chair, his name remains unmentioned. The dangerous upstart had nevertheless been implicated in the interests of Theophylact's party. He entered into an intrigue with Marozia and married her.[1] This marriage must have taken place previous to the year 915, and must have been arranged either by Sergius III. or John X., in order to convert a doubtful neighbour into a friend.[2]

He marries Marozia.

Theophylact, and after him Alberic, introduced a new epoch in Roman history, or, more correctly speaking, the wives of these two men subjugated the city and held it under their spell for a considerable length of time. In the history of the Popes, to which, as to a monastery or temple, only holy women should have access, these intriguing and voluptuous figures present a profane spectacle. However exaggerated may be the terms which various writers in a spirit of petty malice have adopted when describing this dark period of history, the fact nevertheless remains that, even to the eyes of dismayed Catholics, the Church of that time appeared like a brothel.[3] The fact—

[1] *Accepit una de nobilibus Romanis, cujus nomine superest, Theophilacti filia, non quasi uxor, sed in consuetudinem malignam ;* thus Ben. of Soracte. But could the proud Theophylact have consented to such concubinage?

[2] I do not hold, with Duret, that the family of Theophylact was hostile to Sergius. For how then could the report of his intrigue with Marozia have arisen? I believe Sergius to have been a member of the family in which his name was preserved.

[3] Liutprand borrows the epithets *scortum* and *meretrices* for his

which is undeniable—that for a time women bestowed the Papal Crown and ruled the city is assuredly humiliating for the Romans of that age; but instead of surveying this fact under the magnifying glass of moral contemplation, it is better to regard it as a historic phenomenon. During the space of five hundred years the history of the city has not exhibited women of prominence. Since the days of Placidia and Eudoxia, except the Goth Amalasuntha, who shone elsewhere than in Rome, some pious nuns exercising a spiritual influence, like the friends of Jerome or the sister of Benedict, have alone met our eyes. Throughout the entire course of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, no Roman woman appears possessed of sufficient individuality to merit even a passing tribute. This, however, is scarcely surprising, for Rome was an entirely clerical city. When, in the beginning of the tenth century, some women, distinguished by beauty, power and fortune, suddenly appear, they point to an altered condition of things among the Romans. They denote, that is to say, the decline of the ecclesiastical element and the preponderating influence of secular society. It is unnecessary to recall the part played by women at the bigoted court of the Carolingians, the career of Waldrada being still vividly before us. This century formed a period of deep moral decadence. To the glorious victory which Nicholas I. had achieved

description; and since Baronius the conception of this age as that of the rule of harlots has been set forth. Thus Löscher, *Historie des römischen Hürenregiments*, Leipzig, 1707. The rule of John X. was assuredly no such rule.

in the name of Christian morality over the passions of a king, princes and bishops replied by an outbreak of vices, old and new.[1] The same conditions of unbridled excess prevailed in Rome and in the patrimonies, where wealthy and sensual nobles, secular or spiritual, had sprung up in every district. Out of a process of decomposition such as this these women arose. They represent no isolated cases. Other beautiful women headed factions in other parts of Italy. A Theodora or a Marozia of the tenth century is not humanised by the outward show of classic culture, such as that which surrounds Lucrezia Borgia, the daughter of a later Pope. These Roman women were probably unable either to read or write, and, living in a time of utter moral barbarism are to be measured by the age to which they belong.[2] It was, however, an age scarcely more immoral than the refined period of a Catherine of Russia or a Pompadour. In the restricted circle of the Roman world we have in Theodora and Marozia no later Messalinas, but ambitious women of great intelligence and courage, covetous alike of power and pleasure. Their striking figures form a curious interruption to the cloistral monotony of the history of the Papacy.

[1] In the Acts of the Council of Trosle we may read the description given by Heriveus, Archbishop of Rheims, of the undisciplined life of the clergy; see Labbé, *Concil.*, xi. 731.

[2] In 945 Marozza and Stephania, daughters of the younger Theodora, put their marks to a diploma as unable to write: *Signum † manu suprascripta Marozza nobil. femina donatrice qui supra lra † n.* (that is to say, *literae nescia*), and similarly Stephania. Marini, n. C. p. 157.

3. Terrible Devastation inflicted by the Saracens —Destruction of Farfa — Subiaco — Saracen Strongholds in the Campagna—John X. offers Berengar the Imperial Crown — Berengar's Entry into Rome—His Coronation early in December, 915.

John X., Pope, 914-928.

John X. ascended S. Peter's Chair in the spring of 914.[1] Although he owed the Papal dignity directly to the favour of Theodora and the influence of the Consul Theophylact, he was no complaisant courtier, but on the contrary showed himself of so vigorous and independent a character as to surpass the fame of his predecessor, John VIII., and to prove himself the foremost statesman of the age.

Raids of the Saracens.

Precisely at this time Rome was filled with dismay by the news of fresh inroads of the Saracens settled on the Garigliano. Atenulf of Benevento, Landulf of Capua, Guaimar of Salerno, had in vain made war against them. The formidable brigands continued to ravage Campania, the Sabina and Tuscany. There was no eloquent voice, such as that of John VIII., to describe the sufferings of these provinces; but documents of Sergius III. give utterance to the outcry which arose over the desolation inflicted on the Campagna. Thanks to the honourable exertions of earlier Popes, Rome itself was protected by its walls. The surrounding district, however, had been entirely burnt by the Saracens, and more than one

[1] Duret placed the consecration of John X. in the second half of March; Löwenfeld (Jaffé, R. P. 2 Ed.), sometime in March.

deserted church (*in desertis posita*, or *destructa*) in the neighbourhood of the city is mentioned in diplomas of the time. The Sabine territory, with its wealthy abbeys, had been repeatedly devastated. The Imperial monastery of Farfa was, next to the Lombard Nonantula, the most beautiful monastery in Italy. Its splendid church, dedicated to the Virgin, was surrounded by five other basilicas. An Imperial palace and numerous dwelling-houses stood within its precincts. Both inside and outside the building were colonnades (*arcus deambulatorii*) destined for the recreation of the monks, and the whole abbey was surrounded by walls and towers like a fortified city.[1] If we examine the valuable parchment manuscript of the Farfa Regesta preserved in the Vatican, and read the six folio pages which, in minute characters, contain the catalogue of estates, fortresses, churches and villas belonging to the monastery in the Sabina, in the March of Fermo, in Roman territory and even within the city itself, the list seems rather that of the possessions of some powerful principality. The administration of the domains would have demanded an army of officials; the vassals, however, great and petty barons of Central Italy, who rented the estates, relieved the Abbot from the burthensome responsibility.[1] From the middle

Farfa destroyed.

[1] *Liber destructionis Farfensis*, by the Abbot Hugo (p. 533), edited by the meritorious Bethmann: *Mon. Germ.*, t. xiii.

[2] He equipped a vessel which had access to the ports of the Empire free of duty. Privil. of Lothar of Dec. 18, 882, *Reg. Farf.*, n. 281: *Unam navim concessimus*, &c. The taxes to which vessels were then subject are characteristic of the barbarism of the time: *nullum telonaticum, aut ripaticum, paraticum, pontaticum, salutaticum, ces-*

of the ninth century onwards the Arab hordes had threatened the Abbey. They surrounded it with increased force about the year 890. The Abbot Peter, with his vassals, held out bravely for seven years, then recognised that its salvation was hopeless. He divided the treasures of the convent, sent some to Rome, some to Fermo, some to Rieti. He destroyed the valuable Ciborium of the high altar, buried the onyx columns in the ground, and left the Abbey. But the beauty of the building moved the Saracens to forbearance. They made use of Farfa merely as a temporary lodging; Christian spoilers, however, who dwelt in the neighbourhood, set fire to it; and for thirty years the renowned Abbey lay a heap of ashes on the ground.

Subiaco destroyed.

Subiaco had perished even earlier, having been destroyed by the Arabs about the year 840. The monastery was soon restored by the Abbot Peter, but fell a second time into Saracen hands.[1] The spoilers ravaged the entire region of the Anio, from where the stream, issuing from the gorges of Jenne and Trevi, flows to Tivoli, and thence onward through the Roman Campagna. Even now in these districts, where fable told of settlements earlier than Rome herself, traditions of the Saracens still linger. The stronghold of Saracinesco, remarkable for the ancient

Saracinesco.

pitaticum, cenaticum, pastionem, laudaticum, travaticum, pulveraticum —accipere audeat.

[1] The bull of Nicholas I. of 858, and that of Leo VII. of 936, refer to this destruction. *Il Regesto Sublacense . . .* ed. Allodi e Levi, Rome, 1885, pp. 13, 46. The monastery is still without its history; Jannucelli's *Memorie di Subiaco*, Genoa, 1856, being devoid of scientific value.

costumes and customs of its inhabitants, still stands on its rocky mountain ridge behind Tivoli. Its name is derived from the Arabs who entrenched themselves here in the ninth century.[1] On the other side of the mountain, amid the vast rocky recesses of the Sabines, lies Ciciliano, which in the days of John X. was also a stronghold of the Saracens.[2] Travellers coming from the north to Rome on crossing the Alps found their way barred by the Spanish Moors who had been settled at Frejus or Fraxinetum since 891. Did they succeed in purchasing their freedom, they fell into the hands of the Saracens on the roads of Narni, Rieti or Nepi. No pilgrim any longer succeeded in bringing his gifts to Rome. And this reign of terror lasted for thirty years. All central authority had ceased in the provinces, where every town, every fortress, every abbey was abandoned to itself.[3]

John X. at last took compassion on his country and became the deliverer of Italy. The infidels had no greater enemy than this Pope, who made it his mission to rescue Rome and the Church itself. He called to mind all that the Imperial power

[1] Nibby (*Anal.*, iii. 61) says that Arabic names are still heard in this neighbourhood, such, for instance, as Mastorre, Argante, Morgante, Marocco, Merant, Manasse, Margutte. A second Saracinesco, formerly a Moorish fortress, still stands in the diocese of Monte Casino.

[2] Bened. of Soracte, c. 29: *Audientes Sarracenis, qui erat in Narniensi comitato, Ortense, et qui erant in Ciculi*, &c. The derivation of Fatteschi (*Serie*, &c., p. 246) from Equicoli seems to be right; in some of the Farfa documents belonging to the year 762 we find: *in Eciculis;* here the Equi lived in former times, and the district was called *castaldatus Equanus.*

[3] *Regnaverunt Aggarenis in Romano regno anni* 30, *redacta est terra in solitudine.* Bened. of Soracte, c. 27.

had once been able to effect. He remembered the universal summons under Lewis II., who had successfully led the Italians against the Saracens. He beheld the ever increasing decline of political order, the ruin of which must involve the ruin of Rome, and would leave the city the prey of the boldest or most fortunate of the princes. He therefore resolved to restore the Imperial power, as John IX. had done. The blind Lewis, it is true, still bore the Imperial title in Provence, but his claim had no longer any value in Italy. On the contrary, the northern part of the country was swayed by the mild sceptre of Berengar, who was now, as Lambert had previously been, the hope of the national party. The Pope declared himself in favour of this party; and after he had assured himself of the success of his design, he decided to bestow the crown on Berengar, in order through him to establish an independent Italian empire.

John X. summons Berengar to be crowned Emperor.

Berengar, summoned by Papal messengers, set forth for Rome in November. His splendid reception shows that the Pope had gained the vote of the Romans, and that the ruling faction was that of the Italians. An unknown poet of the Court, an eye-witness, has minutely described the entrance and coronation of his royal master. His sonorous hexameters, an isolated product of Italy's now impoverished muse, modestly adorned with flowers from Virgil and Statius, remind us of the entrance of Honorius, once celebrated by Claudian.[1] Berengar,

[1] The *Paneg. Bereng. Imp.* was written by a Lombard grammarian shortly before the death of the Emperor; it was brought to light by

Entry of Berengar.

like his predecessors, advanced across the Field of Nero under Monte Mario; the nobles or Senate and the city militia greeted him with the customary *laudes*, and the poet remarks that their lances were ornamented with images of wild animals, *i.e.*, with eagles, lions, wolves, and the heads of dragons.[1] The Scholae were present as usual, and at their head the poet, inspired by reverence for classic antiquity, places the Schola of the Greeks, with its "Daedalian hymn of praise." The remaining companies saluted Berengar, each in its native tongue. The homage of two white-robed and distinguished youths, namely, Peter, the Pope's brother, and the son of the Consul Theophylact, did not escape the notice of the poet. While the Pope and the Consul of the Romans are here placed together side by side (one sending his brother, the other his son, to meet the King), they appear almost as two powers, the aristocracy standing beside the Papacy in the guise of a civic power.

Adrian Valesius (Paris, 1663). Printed in *Mon. Germ.*, iv.; most correctly by Dümmler, *Gesta Ber. Imp.*, Halle, 1871. The poet indicates the pressure of the Saracens:

Summus erat pastor tunc temporis Urbe Johannes,
Officio affatim clarus sophiaque repletus,
Atque diu talem merito servatus ad usum.
Quotenus huic prohibebat opes vicina Charybdis,
Purpura quas dederat majorum sponte beato,
Limina qui reserat castis rutilantia, Petro.

[1] *Praefigens sudibus rictus sine carne ferarum.* The regions had their badges. Henry V. was received by *aquiliferi*, *leoniferi*, *lupiferi*, *draconarii*; *Chron. Casin.*, iv. c. 37. In the *Ordo Rom.*, xi. and xiii., the standard-bearers are already called *milites draconarii*, *portantes XII. vexilla*, *quae bandora vocantur* (Mabillon, *Mus. It.*, ii. 128), and simply 12 *bandonarii cum* 12 *vexillis rubeis* (p. 228). This then in saec. xii. and xiii.

John, seated on a Kliothedrum (a folding seat), awaited the arrival of the prince at the top of the steps in front of S. Peter's. Berengar rode a palfrey from the Papal stables. The pressure of the crowd was so great that he could scarcely reach the Pope. After tendering the oath which granted protection and justice to the Church, the doors of the basilica were opened; the traditional prayer was said before the shrine, and the King was conducted to the Lateran palace. The coronation took place with the customary ceremonies in the early days of December 915. A Papal lector read the diploma of the new Emperor, in which Berengar confirmed the Roman Church in her possessions. The solemnity ended with the presentation of gifts by the Emperor to the basilica of S. Peter, to the clergy, nobility, and people.[1]

He is crowned Emperor in the beginning of Dec. 915.

And thus, with the disavowal of the rights of the blinded Lewis, the Imperial Crown was for the third time made over to a prince, who, although of German ancestry, belonged to Italy. The country now hoped

[1] I found an unpublished diploma of Berengar in the *Cod. Amiat. Sessor.*, ccxiv. p. 435 and ccxvii. n. 181, which shows that the coronation took place in the beginning of Dec. 915, probably on the first day of Advent. This diploma is a privilegium given to the abbey, which it bestows on the Margrave Wido; it begins: *In Nom. D. Dei Eterni. Berengarius Imp. Aug. Dignum est ut qui prudenter Dei obsequia*, &c., and ends: *Signum domni† Berengarii seren Imp. Joannes cancellarius ad vicem Ardinghi ep. et archicancell. recognovi*, &c. *Data VI., Id. Dec. A. D. Incarn. DCCCCXV. domni vero Bereng. seren. Regis XXVIII. Imp. sui primo Ind. IV. Actum Rome in Xpi nomine feliciter. Amen.* It therefore dates from Dec. 8, 915, when Berengar was already crowned. He had been in Lucca on Nov. 10. The document has since been printed in full by Dümmler, *Forschung. z. Deutsch. Gesch.*, x. 289.

for unity, independence, and internal order, while the Pope reckoned on the energetic activity of the new Emperor.

4. Campaign against the Saracens—Battles in the Sabina and Campagna — Treaty between John X. and the Princes of Southern Italy — Annihilation of the Saracen Forces on the Garigliano in August 916—The Pope and Alberic return to Rome—Position of Alberic—Overthrow of Berengar—Its consequences in Rome—Uncertainty concerning Alberic's end.

Italian-Byzantine League against the Saracens.

The results of Berengar's coronation showed themselves in the brilliant campaign which was immediately undertaken against the Saracens. The awakening spirit of nationality animated and united the Italians, so that they streamed forth in crowds to follow the banner in this honourable crusade. The new Emperor did not, it is true, place himself at their head. After having come to an agreement with the princes of Southern Italy and the Byzantines respecting a common enterprise against the Saracens, he was called by urgent affairs to the northern provinces.[1] He placed troops, however, at the disposal of the Pope; namely, the Tuscans under the Margrave Adalbert, and the forces of Spoleto and Camerino led by Alberic. The great league had been formed successfully. The princes of Southern Italy were united; even the Byzantine Emperor suppressed his

[1] The Chronicon Duc. Neapol. in Prattilli (t. iii., *Hist. Princ. Langob.*), which describes these particulars, is a fiction.

resentment and extended his hand to the Emperor of the Romans. The young Constantine had equipped a fleet and placed it under the command of the strategist, Nicholas Picingli. As a great part of Calabria and Apulia again obeyed the Greeks, who continued to call their possessions in these parts by the name of Lombardy, the Byzantine government desired to appear prepared for war in Southern Italy.[1] Picingli brought the still coveted title of Patricius to the Dukes of Gaeta and Naples in the spring of 916. He induced these former friends of the Saracens to take part in the league, and then stationed his fleet off the mouth of the Garigliano, while the army of South Italy took up its position below the Saracen fortress on the seaward side. Landwards the troops advanced, led by John in person. The Pope, with indefatigable energy, had collected the Roman militia from Latium, Roman Tuscany, the Sabina, and all his other states, and had united them with the troops sent by Tuscany and Spoleto. The army was under the command of the Senator Theophylact and Alberic, who probably acted as generals.[2] The Saracens, overpowered by superior numbers, were driven out of the Sabina, where, and in Latin Campania, the first struggles took

The united army of the League lays siege to the Fortress on the Garigliano.

[1] The Thema Λογγεβαρδίας is the eleventh European theme in the system of Constantine Porphyrogenetos, and had apparently Bari as its capital. Schlummberger, *Sigillographie de l'Empire Byzantin*, Paris, 1884, p. 217.

[2] *Papa Joh.* (here confused with Joh. XI.) *undique hostium gentes congregari jussit in unum, et non tantum Romanum exercitum, sed et Tuscos, Spoletinosque in suum suffragium conduxit.* Anon. Salern., c. 143. The silence of the Panegyr. concerning Alberic on the occasion of the Imperial coronation shows that at this time he had no position in the city.

place. The Lombards of Rieti under Agiprand threw themselves on the enemy at Trevi. The militia of Sutri and Nepi fought bravely at Baccano until the Mohammedans were compelled to fly to the Garigliano whither, apart from this, their harassed brethren might have summoned them. It appears that John had gained a victory near Tivoli and Vicovaro, the remembrance of which still lingers in tradition.[1] He met the princes of South Italy at Terracina and concluded a formal treaty with them, for these gentlemen demanded compensation for their share in the league. The Pope was obliged to renounce several claims of the Church in Southern Campania. Beside the patrimonies in Traetto, John, Duke of Gaeta, received the duchy of Fundi. Both these territories had long been in the possession of the Roman Church, and by it had been administered through lay officials bearing the title of count or consul and dux.[2] John VIII., however, in similar circumstances, had ceded them to Docibilis and John of Gaeta in 872, and John X. now found himself obliged to confirm the donation. The cession was concluded in the camp of the allied armies on the Garigliano. The Roman

Treaty between John X. and the Princes of South Italy.

[1] The battle in the Sabina is described by Benedict of Soracte, c. 29. *Tribulana* is probably the ancient Trevi. Martin. Polon., Dandolo and Amalr. Auger, speak of a victory of John *prope Romanam Urbem*. The tradition of the monastery of S. Cosimato near Vicovaro may refer to it.

[2] The archives of the *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus* in Monte Casino mention for the year 841, *Enee Grosso Consul et Rector Patrimonii Cajetani*; 851, *Mercurius Consul et Dux Patrim. Trajectani*. Long after the cession of Traetto the family of the Lombard Count, *Dauferius, Lando, Ederad and Marinus*, are found in the neighbourhood. The same Cod. shows that there were duces at Fundi.

nobles, commanding as Papal generals in the army, on their side signed the diploma, which enumerates them by name. At their head stood Theophylact, the Senator of the Romans, following him the dukes, Gratian, Gregory, Austoald (a German), the Primicerius Sergius, the Secundicerius Stephen, Sergius de Eufemia, Adrianus, "father of the lord Pope Stephen (VI.)," Stephen, Primicerius of the Defensors, the Arcarius Stephen, the Sacellarius Theophylact. At John's command seventeen other nobles, whose names, however, are not given, swore adhesion to the treaty. It was also signed by the princes and generals of the league. First came Nicholas (Picingli), Stratigus of Greek Lombardy, then Gregory, Consul of Naples, Landulf Imperial Patricius Duke of Capua, Atenulf of Benevento, Guaimar, Prince of Salerno, John and Docibilis, the "glorious," dukes and consuls of Gaeta.[1]

[1] This barbarous diploma is contained in the Placitum of Castrum Argenteum, near Traetto, July 1014: Gattula, *Hist. Acc.*, p. 109; Federici, *Storia dei Duchi di Gaeta*, p. 150. The bulls of John VIII. and X. are here promiscuously thrown together. *Ille pridie idus junii Theofilactus secdiclerius S. Sed. Ap. scripserat, imperante Domino suo piiss. p. p. August. Lo . . . ico magno imp. i.e. suprascripta quinta, script. per manum Melchiset—. Ind. V.* is the year 872, and the Emperor is Lewis II. *Ind. IV.* is the year 916, and here the diploma confuses the two bulls. *Idest—quomodo repromiserat Theofilactus Senatores Romanorum, Gratianus Dux, Gregorius Dux, Austoaldus Dux, Sergius . . . et per jussionem—Joann. X.—jurare fecerat alios decem et septem nobiliores homines, qualiter illi querere Nicolao stratico Langobardie, Gregorius Neopolitano consuli, et Landolfum imperiali patritiu, et Atenolfo, et Guamario principibus, Johanni, et Docibilis gloriosi Ducibus, et Ipati Gajetanorum . . . pro eo quod decertaverat, et percertaverunt, pro amore Christianae fidei delere Saracenos de cuncto territorio Apostolorum.* It is singular that Alberic is not mentioned.

Defeat of the Saracens in the Summer of 916.

The attack upon the Saracen entrenchments began in June 916. The infidels defended themselves obstinately for two months. Having no prospect of relief from Sicily, they finally resolved to make their escape to the mountains. One night they set fire to their camp and rushed out, but either fell under the sword of the infuriated Christians or were thrown into imprisonment; such as had escaped to the mountains were there put to death. The den of robbers on the Garigliano, which had been the terror of Italy for more than thirty years, was thus at last annihilated. Its destruction constitutes the most honourable national achievement of the Italians during the tenth century, as the victory at Ostia had been its greatest triumph in the ninth.[1]

John X. and Alberic return in triumph to Rome.

John X. now returned to Rome like a triumphator from a Punic war. Chroniclers are silent with regard to the thanksgiving festival in the city and the entrance of the liberator. The Pope must have been preceded by a troop of captive Saracens, led in triumph; and we may be sure that, with the Margrave Alberic by his side, and at the head of the Roman dukes and consuls, he made his entry by one of the southern gates, amid the acclamations of the

[1] Leo of Ostia, who speaks of Alberic, i. c. 52, wrongly gives August 915, *Ind. III.*, instead of 916, *Ind. IV.* Previously, however, he says: *Joh. X. tricennio ante Romam invaserat.* Lupus Protosp., about 1088 (*Mon. Germ.*, vii.): *a.* 916 *exierunt Saraceni de Gariliano.* Liutprand cursorily mentions this battle, *Antapod.*, ii. c. 52; *Chron. Farf.*; *Chron. S. Vincent*; Bened. of Soracte. John X. himself announced his victory to Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne; Flosz, *Leonis, P. VIII. privileg.*, p. 105; in Dümmler, *Gesch. der ostfränk. Kaiser*, ii., 601. He had twice encountered the Saracens in person.

people.[1] Alberic, greeted with every mark of distinction by the city, must have demanded and received a recompense. It is probable that the Pope not only rewarded him with estates, but also bestowed upon him the dignity of Consul of the Romans. A short time before he had married Marozia, daughter of the Senator Theophylact, and after the victory at the Garigliano he was assured of an influential position in Rome.[2] We must admit, however, that we know nothing of Alberic's actions, nothing even of his many years' sojourn in the city. The Senator Theophylact also is lost to sight. It is said that Alberic's son was born in the family palace on the Aventine, and there the Margrave and Consul may have dwelt. As long as Berengar's power endured, and Rome remained under the energetic rule of the pope who was friendly to Berengar, no opportunity could have been offered Alberic for the furtherance of his ambitious designs. On the contrary, he probably remained for some years the chief support of the Pope.

The condition of affairs in Italy was meanwhile

[1] Bened. of Soracte (c. 29) expressly mentions Alberic with the Pope as heroes of the war. *Et preliaverunt prelium magnum; et victores Johannes X. papa, et Albericus marchiones, honorifice susceptum Albericus marchio a Romano populo.* He extols him as *elangiforme* (*elegantis formae*).

[2] Bened. of Soracte (c. 29) says that he became the lover of Theophylact's daughter; I, however, place the date of this intimacy some years earlier. His son Alberic became ruler of Rome in 932,—if only born in 917, he would consequently have only been 15 years of age. My belief is that John X. effected a marriage between Theodora's daughter and Alberic when he became Pope, therefore in 914. It is a remarkable fact that Bened. of Soracte never mentions Marozia by name. Leo of Ostia, i. c. 61, calls Alberic Consul of the Romans.

changed by a violent revolution. The restless nobles of Tuscany and Lombardy, headed by Adalbert, Margrave of Ivrea (the husband of Berengar's daughter Gisela), rose in arms against the Emperor. These petty tyrants ridiculed Italian nationality, or rather possessed no conception of the idea, nor cherished any higher interest than their own individual aims. Instigated by the ancient curse, the desire of ridding themselves of one master by means of another, they again invited a foreigner into the country. And again it was Italian princes and bishops who needlessly destroyed the hope of Italian independence, and sold their country to the stranger. The annals of no other nation reveal a policy so disastrous as the policy pursued by Italy during a long course of centuries. If it cannot be denied that the Popes favoured Italian disunion, still the Popes were not alone and always guilty. On the contrary, it must candidly be admitted that during a long period the Papacy was the sole power in Italy, even in a political aspect, and that in its absence the country would have sunk into yet deeper distress.

The innocent John X. saw the work which he had created fall to ruin. Rudolf, king of Cisalpine Burgundy, crossed the Alps to take the offered crown. We make no attempt to describe the battles which took place between Berengar and Rudolf and the Italian rebels, but only remark in passing that the unfortunate Emperor was forced into treachery to his country, and in his despair summoned the dreaded Hungarians to his aid. The Hungarians burnt Pavia, the ancient seat of the Lombard monarchy, which

Liutprand describes as so beautiful as to surpass even world-renowned Rome. The Emperor Berengar, whose strength and goodness are extolled by his contemporaries, but regarding whose actions history has little to say, fell by the hand of an assassin in Verona in this same year 924. Of the three national Emperors (Guido, Lambert and Berengar) elected by the Italians after the death of Charles the Fat, he was the third and last. Henceforth, owing to the faults and weakness of the Italians themselves, the Imperium was lost to the nation for ever. True, the conditions of other countries were at this period so terrible that in the Council of Trosle in 909, Heriveus, Bishop of Rheims, compares mankind to the fish of the sea which devour one another. Italy, however, was in a state of such frightful dissolution that her sufferings far exceeded those of other nations. Torn by factions great and small, by spiritual and secular tyrants, it was impossible for Italy to fight for independence. The title of Roman Emperor now vanished for thirty-seven years, until the Imperial crown was again resumed by a foreigner, a Saxon hero who bequeathed it to kings of German race.

Death of Berengar, 924.

Italy sank into chaotic anarchy. Throughout the entire country we see nothing but smoking cities, upon whose ruins the savage Hungarians hold their wild Bacchanalia, the inhabitants flying for refuge to the mountains. We see kings, vassals, and bishops struggling for the blood-stained shreds of power, and beautiful laughing women who, like Furies, seem to head the wild procession. Contemporary chronicles or records of immediately succeeding times are so

Fall of Alberic.

confused as to present but a labyrinth to the student, and are silent regarding Alberic. Since, however, it lies in the nature of things that an ambitious man should have seized the opportunity to increase his power, and if it must in all reason be assumed that he was goaded on by the ambition of his wife Marozia, we may fairly conclude that after the death of the Emperor he desired the now vacant Patriciate. We may believe that, as later chroniclers assert, he quarrelled with the Pope, that he seized the government of the city, and ruled Rome with despotic power, until the shrewd pontiff, with the help of the Romans, succeeded in driving the alien from the city. Further, that Alberic then defended himself in Horta, probably the chief place in his possessions, that he summoned the Hungarians to his aid, and that he was attacked and slain in his fortress by the infuriated Roman militia.[1] It is only too certain that the hordes of the Magyars now laid waste the Roman Campagna, and henceforward repeatedly appeared before the gates of the city.[2]

[1] *Sed postea discordia interveniente marchio ex urbe expulsus in Orta Castrum extruens ibi se recepit*—this, it is true, is only related by Martin Polon., Ptol. Lucensis, Ricobald, Bern. Guidonis, Leo of Como, Galvaneus, Platina, Sigonius. Muratori, *Antich. Estensi*, I. c. 23. Provana also believes in Alberic's defection.

[2] A document of the year 1044 says: *foris ponte Salario ubi dicitur due sorore et portu ungariscu;* Galletti, *Mscr. Vat.*, 8048, p. 127. Bened. of Soracte (c. 29, 30) represents the Hungarians as summoned by Peter: *Erat—Petrus marchiones germanus—papae. Talis odium et rixa inter Romanos et marchio, ut non in urbem R. ingredi deberet: ingressus P. marchio in civitas Ortuense—edificavit castrum firmissimus, et plus magis seviebant romani et amplius P. m. urbem R. non est ausus ingredi. Statimque nuntius transmisit ad ungarorum gens—ungaror.*

Alberic's end remains veiled in mystery. His name, his ambition, his courage and shrewdness he bequeathed, however, to his more fortunate son, to whom Rome was a few years later forced to yield obedience.[1]

gens in Italia ingressi sunt, simul cum. P. marchio in urbem R. ingressus est. He describes a battle between the Romans and the Hungarians outside the Porta S. Giovanni in the time of John XI., and says that the Lombard Joseph (probably Dux of the Sabina) annihilated the enemy at Rieti. Liverani holds that Alberic, having separated from Marozia, had fled with Peter to Horta; that the populace had afterwards put Peter (who had returned to the city) to death at the Lateran, and had then likewise put Alberic to death at Horta. Liutprand, however, contradicts this sequence of events, and Benedict's account is utterly confused. It was only after Alberic's death that Marozia married Guido, and not until then (928) did Peter and the Pope fall. But if Alberic had been driven forth by Marozia and the Tusculans, how is it possible that he could have been, as Liverani supposes, head of the Tusculan family?

[1] Besides the Placitum of Corneto near Fermo, where in 910 Waldipert appears as *Vicecomes Alberici Marchionis* (*Chron. Casaur.* Murat, ii. 2, 591), and besides a notice of some donations of Alberic (*Chron. Farf.*, p. 461), I know of no document concerning him. Innumerable genealogical trees represent him as head of the family of Tusculum. The *Regest. Farf.* does not mention Counts of Tusculum. Bened. of Soracte is only acquainted with the Marchio Albericus. It is therefore absurd to call Alberic, as Duret calls him, Count of Tusculum. For the first time in 999, Gregory is spoken of as "Tusculanus." I have carefully examined Galletti's manuscript (*Storia Geneal. de' Conti Tuscul.*, *de' Stefaneschi*, *Papareschi*, *Normanni*, *Cod. Vat.*, 8042 sq.), and honour the insight of the man, who at that time knew nothing of Tusculan Counts. So likewise Muratori and Coppi.

5. Rudolf of Burgundy is driven from the Country —Feminine Intrigues with regard to Hugo— John X. forms a Treaty with him—Marozia marries Guido of Tuscany—Perplexities of John X.—Banishment of his Brother Peter— Revolution in Rome—Murder of Peter—Fall and Death of John X.

Fall of Rudolf.

Rudolf of Burgundy meanwhile only retained the crown of Italy for three years. He was then overthrown by a powerful faction headed by Irmengard, the second wife and now the widow of Adalbert of Ivrea. In order to understand the complex developments of Roman history, we are forced to introduce a multitude of people, and to describe the relations which they bore to one another. The charms of the celebrated Waldrada had been inherited by her descendants; the flames of passion burnt with increased strength in her children and grandchildren, and kindled the length and breadth of Italy. Her daughter Bertha, the child of an illicit passion, had married Count Theobald of Provence, and by him had become the mother of Hugo. As a widow Bertha captivated Adalbert II., the rich Margrave of Tuscany. She married him and bore him three children, Guido, Lambert, and Irmengard. The extraordinary influence which she possessed in Tuscany she bequeathed to her Tuscan children. She had striven to acquire the crown of Italy for Hugo of Provence, the favourite son of her first marriage. Death in 925 prevented the fulfilment of her design, but the scheme was re-

Irmengard exalts Hugo.

sumed by Guido, Lambert and Irmengard. Irmengard, now the widow of the Margrave of Ivrea, by her charms and intrigues had won the support of the Lombard nobles. If we may trust the somewhat romantic accounts of the time, this celebrated woman was not surpassed in her powers of fascination either by the Greek Helen or the Egyptian Cleopatra. Bishops, counts and kings did homage at her feet. Rudolf of Burgundy himself was lured into her toils, and the new Circe took the crown of Lombardy from his head to place it on that of her step-brother Hugo. The contempt of the Lombard nobles was aroused. The Archbishop of Milan, whom Rudolf had betrayed, and who was the most influential man in northern Italy, renounced the Burgundian, and the nobles on their side summoned Hugo to the country.

The Pope united his invitation to the summons of the nobles. In Rome John X. found himself driven to sore straits by the party of Marozia, who had inherited the wealth, the adherents and the power of her dead parents. He therefore sought to repress the factions with a strong hand; and contemplating a restoration of the Empire, united with the Lombards in fixing his desires on Hugo of Provence. He sent envoys to Hugo; they met the prince at Pisa, where he had landed; and after he had been crowned at Pavia as king of Italy in 926, he proceeded to Mantua, where he met the Pope. Together they concluded a treaty.[1] It is probable that John offered Hugo the Imperial crown on condition that he would deliver him, the Pope, out of the hands of his enemies. John,

Hugo, King of Italy, 926.

[1] *Foedus cum eo percussit.* Liutpr., iii. c. 16.

Marozia becomes powerful in Rome.

however, deceived himself as to the result both of his journey and his negotiations, for Marozia's power now became more formidable than ever. Scarcely was the widow of Alberic aware that Hugo was about to receive the crown of Italy, when, with prudent foresight, she turned her thoughts towards his powerful step-brother. She offered her hand to Guido, the reigning Margrave of Tuscany; and Guido on his part scorned neither the rich Senatrix of Rome, nor the inviting prospect of dominion over the city. The faction of Theophylact or now of Marozia, which had formerly favoured national interests under Berengar, thus sided with the Tuscans, who were most active in behalf of the elevation of the Provençal prince.

The perplexed Pope only returned to Rome to fall a victim to his opponents. During two stormy years he held his own against the sword of the enemy, and the fact affords a striking proof of his prudence and valour. His support, his armed prop was his brother Peter, who has already come prominently forward on the occasion of Berengar's coronation. John, it is believed, had set Peter at the head of the civic government, and after Alberic's death had made him consul of the Romans. It was apparently Peter himself who led the Romans against Alberic, and having vanquished his opponent, conquered Horta. The chronicler of Soracte even calls him Margrave, and unless the chronicler confuses him with Alberic, we may suppose that Peter had appropriated the latter's title and possessions. The meagre records of the time significantly remark that he stood in the way of the faction that wished to overthrow the Pope in

order to place a creature of their own upon the Papal chair, and thus to rule Rome.[1] Guido and Marozia, who on their side aimed at the Patriciate, were as yet by no means rulers of the city. They managed, however, to conceal troops in Rome, and these troops one day attacked the Lateran. If we may believe the chroniclers, Peter had previously been banished to Horta; he had summoned the Hungarians, had appeared with them before Rome, and had now rejoined his brother in the Lateran. He was cut down by the people in sight of the Pope; John himself was seized by Guido's mercenaries and thrown by Marozia into S. Angelo. The Roman people, irritated by the devastation of the country by the Hungarians, summoned first by Alberic, then also, as it was at least reported, by Peter, and hailing with joy every change in the government and every fall of a pope, supported the revolution. This revolution, of which unhappily we know so little, took place in June or July 928. The Pope died in the following year, having been either strangled or starved to death in prison.[2]

Fall of John X. through the instrumentality of Marozia, 926.

[1] *Wido interea, Tusciae provinciae marchio, cum Marocia uxor sua de Johannis papae dejectione cepit vehementer tractare, atque hoc propter invidiam, quam Petro fratri papae habebant, quoniam illum papa sicut fratrem proprium honorabat.* Liutpr., iii. c. 43. He is therefore unaware of Peter's being driven to Horta; and all this took place after the death of Alberic.

[2] The account is given by Liutprand, Bened. of Soracte (c. 29) also knew of the attack in the Lateran: *Romani in ira commoti unanimiter ad palatium Lateran. properantes, interfecto Petro marchio, ad apostolicos nullus adtigit.* He previously said, that Peter, after having summoned the Hungarians, had come from Horta to Rome. That Marozia was accessory to the death of the Pope is asserted not only by Liutprand, but in the year 929 by Flodoard: *dum a quadam potenti*

Thus a strange and undeserved fate overtook the benefactor of Rome. Two women, a mother and daughter, stand at one and the other end of his pontifical career; Theodora who bestowed the Papal crown upon him, and Marozia who deprived him both of crown and life. The circumstances of his elevation and his connection with these infamous women have caused all ecclesiastical writers, more especially Baronius, to execrate his memory. John X., however, the man whose sins are known only by report, whose great qualities are conspicuous in history, stands forth amid the darkness of the time as one of the most memorable figures among the Popes. The acts of the history of the Church praise his activity, and his relations with every country of Christendom. And since he had confirmed the strict rule of Cluny, they further extol him as one of the reformers of monasticism. His attempts to adjust the affairs of Italy, with the help of Berengar, were praiseworthy, and the honour of having delivered his country from the Saracens by the great league adds glory to his name.

Rome preserves no monument of his reign. It is said that he finished the Lateran basilica, and decor-

femina—Marocia principatu privatus sub custodia detineretur, ut quidam vi, ut plures astruunt, actus angore defungitur—thus in his verses: *Patricia deceptus iniqua. Chron. S. Benedicti: ab illis occulto Dei judicio tamen justo vivus depositus est;* another redaction: *vivus laqueo confectus est.* A tradition relates that the Pope was first dragged to S. Leucio in Veroli, and then put to death in Rome. Introduction to the *Statuto di Veroli* in Liverani p. 535. Liutpr.: *ajunt enim, quod cervical super os ejus imponerent, sicque eum fessime suffocarent.* The *Annal. Benevent.* (*M. Germ.*, v); *in castro jugulatus.*

ated the palace with pictures. During the few years of peace which followed the victory of the Garigliano, and from the spoils of the Saracens, he apparently completed in the basilica much that Sergius III. had begun.[1]

[1] The statement of Benedict of Soracte is confirmed by Bonizo: *hic aedificavit basilicam in Palatio Lateran.* It is possible that John X. also restored S. Clemente; the monogram on the choir rails in this church refers to him. We are acquainted with three of his coins: IOH. S. PETRVS BERENGARIV IMP. In the centre, ROMA. The two others bear similar legends.

CHAPTER II.

1. Leo VI. and Stephen VII.—The Son of Marozia succeeds to the Papacy as John XI.—King Hugo — Marozia offers him Rome and her hand—Their Marriage—S. Angelo—Revolution in Rome—The young Alberic seizes the Reins of Power.

Two shadowy Popes succeeded John X., creatures doubtless of the now all-powerful Marozia, who, on account of his youth, dared not yet place her own son upon the Papal chair. Leo VI., son of the Primicerius Christophorus, only reigned for a few months. His predecessor, so violently deposed, still languished in prison. Leo was succeeded by Stephen VII., a Roman also; but although the latter Pope filled the Apostolic Chair for upwards of two years (until February or March 931), the events of his reign are unrecorded,[1] and the existence of these two Popes remains buried in darkness so profound that

Leo VI., Pope, 928–929.

Stephen VII., Pope, 929–931.

[1] *Catal. Vat.*, 1340, gives Leo. VI. seven months. *Catal. Vat.*, 2953 of saec. xii., 6 months and 13 days. *Catal. Vat.*, 1361, 7 months and 15 days. *Catal. Mont. Cas.*, 257, 5 months and 12 days. The Chronicle S. Bened. gives, however, 10 months. Equally various are the statements concerning the time of Stephen. Georgius (on Baronius, A. 926) quotes a diploma from the *Reg. Subl.*, 77 : *Anno Deo prop. Pont. Rom. Stephani P.I. Ind. III. m. Dec. d.* 22 (therefore, A. 929); Pagi believes that he died on March 15, 931.

Liutprand, their younger contemporary, even passes them over in silence, and represents John XI. as the immediate successor of John X. Under the second of these two Popes, the influence of Marozia rose to an unbounded height.

John XI. was the son of this infamous woman, who styled herself not only Senatrix, but also Patricia, being, as she actually was, the temporal ruler of the city and the arbitress of the Papal elections. It is supposed that Sergius III. was the father of the new Pope, but the fact remains doubtful. A woman now tyrannised over the Church and Rome. Her second husband, Guido of Tuscany, who had undoubtedly been appointed Patricius by the Romans, was dead, and his title of Margrave had passed to his brother Lambert. Marozia was no sooner a widow than she planned a third marriage, and Hugo, the King of Italy, was now the object of her ambitious schemes. Lambert was young and energetic, and filled with lofty projects; he was consequently dangerous to the King, who hastened to set him aside and to seize the proffered hand of the Patricia of Rome. John XI., Pope, 931–936.

Intriguing and deceitful, sensual and covetous, bold and unscrupulous, striving by the most treacherous means to extend the boundary of his Italian kingdom, Hugo is the true representative of his time. State and Church in France, as in Italy, had fallen into a state of utter disintegration; while Germany was only casually affected by this Roman contagion. Preserving, as she did, the principles of morality and law, upon Germany devolved the task of restoring the Empire of Charles, together with the Church. The time,

however, was not yet ripe, and Italy was meanwhile to be reduced to the direst extremity. Were it permitted us to linger long outside the city itself, we should describe how Hugo sold the bishoprics and abbeys of Italy, or filled them with his insolent favourites; gave license to every passion, and stifled every feeling of justice. Liutprand, afterwards bishop, lived as page at Hugo's Court at Pavia. His beautiful voice had here won him the favour of the King, and here he acquired that taste for frivolous and witty society which has impressed itself on his writings.

Character of King Hugo.

He heaps praises upon the tyrant Hugo, as Macchiavelli does in later times upon Caesar Borgia. Warped in his judgment by gratitude, political interest, and the recollection of his youthful life at Court, Liutprand extols Hugo as prudent, courageous and liberal, favourably disposed to priests and learning, and boldly calls him a philosopher. The prince was undoubtedly gifted in no common degree. He veiled his licentiousness under a show of chivalry. He frequented the society of holy men, such as Odo of Cluny; but nevertheless remained the most dissolute voluptuary of his time. Even Liutprand, in whose eyes all women were but wantons, upbraids him on the score of his sensual excesses. The bishop, nevertheless, finds amusement in the witticisms of the populace, who bestowed the names of Pagan goddesses on Hugo's various mistresses. Pezzola was called Venus; Rosa, Juno; and the beautiful Roman Stephania Semele. Unscrupulous though he was, the Bishop could not altogether silence the voice of truth, and himself informs us that, in order to obtain the hand of Marozia,

Hugo stooped to defame the memory of his own mother. Canon law forbade as incestuous marriage between brother and sister-in-law, and Marozia had been the wife of Hugo's step-brother Guido. It was in vain that he now publicly declared the three children of his mother Bertha supposititious. Lambert, according to the custom of the time, challenged him to a duel, and as victor proved his legitimacy. Hugo therefore enticed his step-brother into a trap, deprived him of his sight, threw him into prison, and invested his own brother Boso (son of the same father) with the Margravate of Tuscany. The death of his wife Alda having set him free, he then proceeded to Rome to celebrate his marriage with Marozia.

This ambitious senatrix stood above every religious consideration. Her own son was now Pope, and she consequently feared neither censure nor excommunication.[1] Soon after Guido's death she had sent messengers to Hugo offering him her hand and the possession of Rome, where the temporal power no longer lay in the hands of the Pope. She did not, however, feel secure in her dominion. A woman with the aid of men, her vassals, or her adorers, might play a dominant part for a short time, but must ever feel

Marozia offers Hugo her hand.

[1] The Mosaic law compelled the brother to marry his childless sister-in-law. This law, however, had not, as Liutprand supposed, any application in this case since Marozia had children. *Nostra tuo peperisse viro te secula norunt.* Liutprand rises to some sublime verses:

Quid Veneris facibus compulsa Marozia saevis?—
Advenit optatus ceu bos tibi ductus ad aram
Rex Hugo, Romanam potius commotus ob urbem.
Quid juvat, o scelerata, virum sic perdere sanctum?
Crimine dum tanto satagis regina videri,
Amittis magnam Domino tu judice Romam.

the dread that sooner or later the humiliated Romans would throw off the insulting yoke.[1] Marozia's insatiate ambition was flattered by the thought of exchanging the title of Senatrix or Patricia for that of Queen. And since her son, John XI., dared not refuse to set the Imperial crown on the head of his future step-father, the King of Italy, she already saw herself wearing the purple of an Empress. The events which now followed imparted a new character to Roman history. They led for the first time to a tyranny such as the tyrannies of the Greek cities of antiquity, or those of Italian cities in the later Middle Ages.

Hugo is married to Marozia in 932.

Hugo came in March 932, and, following the example of his predecessors, or of Roman laws, caused his troops to encamp outside the walls. He himself entered with a retinue of knights, and surrounded by the clergy and nobility, who greeted him with the homage due to royalty. His marriage with Marozia was solemnised in an ancient tomb, where bridal hall and nuptial chamber had been prepared. The tomb, the fortress of the city, was the Mausoleum of the Emperor Hadrian, whose porphyry sarcophagus still stood in the vault. No other building in the world can show a history so changeful or so tragic as this Castle of S. Angelo. Nor is its part even yet played out. Through centuries—probably less tragic than those of its past—its history may still be continued. We have already had frequent occasion to mention the Mausoleum in the history of the city since the days

In Hadrian's Mausoleum.

[1] The disgrace was even felt by Benedict of Soracte: *subjugatus est Romam potestative in manu femine, sicut in propheta legimus: Feminini dominabunt Hierusalem*, c. 30.

of Honorius, and last saw it, in the time of Pope Gregory I., illuminated by the vision of the Archangel. As early as the eighth century a church, dedicated to S. Michael, had been built on the summit, called from its situation *S. Angeli usque ad coelos* (even to heaven).[1] The worship of the Archangel was already widespread, and as early as the beginning of the century a sanctuary had been dedicated to him at Avranches. Even in the time of Marozia the original purport of S. Angelo had been almost forgotten. The grave of Hadrian had already served for ages as a fortress, it was the strongest fortress in Rome; and it is therefore singular that Liutprand, who saw the Mole of Hadrian with his own eyes, briefly terms it a fortress, without giving it the surname Hadrianeum. Neither does the historian call it the house of Theodoric, under which name the Mausoleum is mentioned by contemporary Frankish chroniclers. While writing the history of current events it would have seemed but natural to describe the fortress as Procopius had described it at the time of the Gothic attack. The regard for antiquity was, however, already extinct, and Liutprand merely says: "A fortress of marvellous workmanship and strength stands at the entrance to Rome. A splendid bridge crosses the Tiber opposite its gates. All who enter or leave the city must cross this bridge, if permitted by the guards of the fortress. The fortress itself, not

[1] *Munitio vero ipsa—tantae altitudinis est, ut ecclesia quae in ejus vertice videtur, in honore summi et celestis miliciae principis archangeli Michaehelis fabricata, dicatur S. Angeli Ecclesia usque ad coelos.* —Liutpr., iii. 44.

to speak of other things (which we regret), is so high that the Church which is built to the Archangel Michael on the summit is called *S. Angeli usque ad coelos.*" [1] The Mausoleum must therefore have worn an imposing aspect and still retained much of its marble panelling. Inscriptions to the Emperors buried within must still have been found upon its walls. These were later copied by the monk of Einsiedeln, but if the statues and colonnades still remained, it can only have been in utterly ruinous condition. Neither is it probable that the statues which had once adorned the bridge of Hadrian still survived.

Hugo was admitted to S. Angelo, and there celebrated his marriage with Marozia, which was probably blessed by John XI., son of the bride. Annalists are silent with regard to the solemnities of this strange marriage, and bestow not a single word on the preparations for the Imperial coronation. If, as was doubtless the case, preparations were in progress, a sudden change in the course of Roman affairs must have made the ceremony impossible. Hugo, in possession of the fortress and with his approaching elevation before his eyes, waxed more imperious. He treated the Roman nobility with contempt and gave deadly offence to his young step-son Alberic, who must have regarded his mother's marriage with in-

[1] *In ingressu Romanae urbis quaedam est miri operis* (thus also Procopius) *mireque fortitudinis constituta munitio; ante cujus januam pons est praeciosissimus super Tiberim fabricatus.* The other bridge (the Neronian), close by, had long been destroyed, and water mills now stood upon its ruins.

dignation, barring as it did his own future path. The intriguing Hugo had conceived the idea of ridding himself of the young Roman on the first convenient opportunity, a fact of which Alberic stood in dread. Forced by his mother to serve his step-father as page, one day, while pouring some water into a basin, the youth splashed it with defiant awkwardness over the hands of the King. He received a blow in the face in return, and thirsting for revenge rushed out of S. Angelo, called the Romans together, and roused their indignation by a speech in which he pointed out that it was a bitter disgrace to yield obedience to a woman and allow themselves to be ruled by the Burgundians—rude barbarians and the former slaves of Rome. He gave emphasis to his words by reminding them of the greatness of ancient Rome; and these recollections, imperishable in the city as the monuments of the past, have always availed on like occasions to arouse the Romans, in the days of Alberic no less than in the days of Crescentius, of Arnold, of Cola di Rienzo, of Stefano Porcari, or the later days of the republicans of 1798 and 1848.[1] The Romans, long prepared for revolt, rose in fury. The alarm bells were rung; the people rushed to arms, barricaded the gates to prevent Hugo's troops from leaving the city, and attacked S.

Revolt of the Romans under the youthful Alberic.

[1] Liutprand puts a witty discourse into Alberic's mouth. *Romanorum aliquando servi, Burgundiones scil., Romanis imperent?* and causes him to give a punning explanation of their name: *Burgundiones a burgo*, and *expulsi*, which a note of the editor of the *Mon. Germ.* curiously explains "*sine* (*αermanice*, 'ohne') *burgo*." Alberic proposed to call them *gurguliones*. All this is very inappropriate to the circumstances.

Flight of Hugo and fall of Marozia, 932.

Angelo. Hugo and Marozia found themselves imprisoned. Hopeless of long defending himself against his assailants, the King resolved on flight. Like a fugitive galley-slave he let himself down from the fortress at night by a rope, and, happy to have escaped death, hurried to his camp. To his shame and disgrace, he then set forth for Lombardy, leaving behind his honour, his wife, and an Imperial Crown.

Such was the unexpected end of Marozia's royal marriage and its attendant festivities. The city, however, was free and filled with rejoicing. The Romans had shaken off at one stroke the monarchy, the empire, and the temporal power of the Pope, and had obtained civic independence. They elected Alberic their prince, and the first act of the young ruler was to send his mother to prison and to cause his brother John XI. to be kept in strict custody in the Lateran.[1]

[1] *Expulsus igiter rex Hugo cum praefata Marozia* (this is wrong) *Romanae urbis Albericus monarchium tenuit, fratre suo Johanne summae atque universali sedi praesidente.* Liutpr., iii. 45. Bened. of Soracte says, that Hugo had intended to deprive Alberic of sight, and that Alberic hereupon entered into a conspiracy with the Romans. Flodoard relates in the *Chron. ad. A.* 933, that travellers returning to Rheims brought the news, that Alberic kept the Pope and Marozia in prison.

2. CHARACTER OF THE REVOLUTION—ALBERIC *Princeps* AND *Senator omnium Romanorum* — SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TITLE—THE SENATE—THE SENATRICES—FOUNDATIONS OF ALBERIC'S POWER—THE ARISTOCRACY—POSITION OF THE BURGHER CLASS—THE CITY MILITIA—THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM UNDER ALBERIC.

Character of the Revolution.

The changes in Rome were in no way prompted by the romantic ideas of antiquity which we shall see develop in the city at a later age. They were essentially aristocratic, and Rome was a republic of nobles. From the time that the Popes had acquired the secular government they had been continuously opposed by the Roman nobility, and with ever increasing success. The strong hand of the first Carolingian had been able to keep the nobility in check; the fall of the Imperial power left them uncontrolled. At the end of the ninth century they had become masters of the civic administration, and under Theodora, and still more under Marozia, they had usurped the reins of power. The illegal influence of a woman—an influence which had rested on the power of her family and on her non-Roman husbands—was removed by the revolution of 932. The same revolution had, however, raised this woman's son to be head of the city, legalising his power by election and title. Depriving the Pope of the secular dominion, it bestowed it on his brother, and the revolution was at the same time a family and a State revolution. In banishing Hugo, the Romans gave it to be understood that they no longer recognised any foreigner, either king or emperor, as their overlord, and that they in-

tended to govern themselves by national institutions. Rome made the remarkable attempt to acquire political independence; and the capital of the world suddenly entered the ranks of the little Italian dukedoms, such as Venice, Naples and Benevento. Within the circuit of the various donations which constituted the State of the Church the Romans wished to form a free secular State, and to limit the Papal authority, as it had been limited in earlier times, entirely to spiritual matters.

Alberic, Prince and Senator of the Romans.

The new title with which the city invested its new overlord was neither that of Consul or Patricius of the Romans, titles which, being generally in use, were commonly assigned him by his contemporaries. The dignity of Patricius at this time signified the entire secular and judicial power in Rome. It was, however, allied with the idea of viceroyship, such as that which the Exarch had once exercised, and therefore pointed to a supreme power above the Patriciate. The Romans would not recognise this power, and therefore gave Alberic the title of *Princeps atque omnium Romanorum Senator*, and Alberic signed his acts according to the style of the period: "We, Alberic, by the Grace of God, humble Prince and Senator of all the Romans."[1] Of these associated dignities only

[1] *Nos Albericus Domini grat. humilis Princeps atque omn. Romanorum Senator:* thus in a valuable diploma of 945 from S. Andrea and Gregorio, edited by Mittarelli, *Annal. Camald.*, i. App. n. xvi., by Ughelli, I, 1026, by Marini, Pap. C. In a bull of Agapitus II., *A.* 955 (Marini, n. 28, p. 38) Alberic is called merely *omnium Rom. Senator*; in chronicles occasionally *gloriosus Rom. princeps*; thus in *Destruct. Farf.*, p. 536. Benedict of Soracte always says *Albericus princeps Romanus*, or *princeps omn. Romanor.* His title *Romanor. Patricius*, it is true,

the title of Princeps was new to Rome. It was a political title, and denoted the declaration of independence made by the city and the Roman State, as also the elevation of Alberic to the dignity of Prince. In the same way Arichis of Benevento had assumed the title of Princeps when, after the fall of Pavia, he declared himself an independent prince. The Kingship being separated from the Papacy, this title signified the power of the temporal prince in opposition to the spiritual, in possession of which the Pope remained. It was therefore placed in an emphatic position before the title of Senator, and it appears that in diplomas and chronicles the title *Senator* is occasionally absent. Neither is it found on the Roman coins of Alberic. The entirely civic dignity of a "Senator of the Romans" had been borne by Theophylact; but it was probably now increased by the addition of "all," and Alberic was herewith acknowledged as head of the city and people.

Extinction of the Senate.

No trace is to be discovered of the existence of the Roman Senate in the eighth century: nor even during the Carolingian period does it show any sign of life. We find the word "Senatus" all the more frequently used in a general sense, however, among historians of the ninth and tenth centuries, and also in documents. Since the Roman Empire had been restored, and the ancient titles of Imperator and Augustus, and even the specification of the Emperors' Post-consulates

stands alone in Flodoard and in the *Vitae Pontif.*, but that he was thus called by the Romans, especially later, is shown by a diploma of the year 983, *Cod. Sessor.*, ccxvii. p. 192, which says: *temp. Alberici olim Romani Patricii.*

had been revived, reminiscences of antiquity were increasingly awakened; and if the Frankish optimates were glad to call themselves "Senatus," how much more eagerly must the Roman nobility have seized on the title. It therefore came so generally into use that we read it even in the Acts of a Council, where it is decreed that the Pope shall be elected by the assembled clergy on the motion of the Senate and people.[1] The views, however, of those writers, who inferred the continued existence of the Senate in the tenth century from the survival of the ancient name, are no longer tenable. The existence of a Senate implies the existence of actual senators, or individual members who called and signed themselves senators; but although we find Romans subscribing themselves as Consul and Dux in numberless documents both before and after this period, we have discovered none in which a Roman calls himself "senator." The title appears only in a collective sense, and is used of the Senate in general, of the noble senators, *i.e.* of the great men of the city. Theophylact was the first Roman who, since the extinction of the ancient Senate, called himself Senator of the Romans; and the addition of "all" shows that there is no thought of a formally-constituted Senate. At the same time we do not believe that the title Senator in Alberic's case corresponds to "Senior" or "Signor," but that it was used to express more definitely his municipal

[1] The Acts of the Synod of John IX., *A.* 898: *constituendus pontifex —eligatur, expetente senatu et populo*; and the Petitio of the Synod of Ravenna of the same year: *Si quis Romanus cujuscumque sit ordinis, sive de clero, sive de Senatu.*

power.[1] While the Romans made over the Consulate to Alberic for life, they expressed his enlarged authority within the new Roman Republic by conferring on him the title of "Senator of all the Romans"; and we must not overlook the fact that in later times also Rome had frequently no more than one Senator. This title was, moreover, hereditary in Alberic's family and in none other. Even the women bore it. His aunt, the younger Theodora, and her daughters, Marozia and Stephania, were called *Senatrix*, and even bore the full title *omnium Romanorum.* Thus, curiously enough, women in Rome were called Senatrix, while at the same time no man bore the title of Senator except Alberic, and afterwards his descendant, Gregory of Tusculum.[2]

[1] Hegel (i. 288) takes Alberic's title to mean simply Senior or Lord. The conception of Senior was already in use in saec. x., even outside Italy. For example in a Roman document of 1006, where Rogata says: *pro anima Johannis Patricii Romanor. germani mei, et Senioris nostri*; not therefore *Senatoris nostri. Cod. Sessor.*, ccxviii. n. 472 (Farfa Diploma). Hegel's view is scarcely tenable. The ancient fragment Hist. Aquitan. (Pithoeus, *Annal. et Hist. Francor.*, Paris, 1688, p. 416) says indefinitely: *et Romani de Senatoribus suis elevaverunt in regno Albericum.*

[2] The *Senatrices Romanorum* all belonged to the same family which was descended from Marozia. They continued to bear the title even after marriage with outsiders. *A.* 970: Stefania *Senatrix* (Petrini, p. 394); *A.* 987, Stefania, wife of the Comes Benedict: *illma. Femina, Comitissa, Senatrix* (Nerini, p. 382). Theodora *Senatrix*, married to Duke John of Naples, is mentioned in the introduction to the Latin edition of the Pseudo-callisthenes of the Archdeacon Leo as *senatrix romanor*, and lauded on account of her virtues. She died about 950: Landgraf, *Die Vita Alexandri Magni des Archpresb. Leo*, Erlangen, 1885, p. 27. In Gaeta, May 1002: *nos Ymilia gr. Dei Senatrix atque Ducissa per consens. D. Joh. glor. Consuli et Duci et nostri Senioris hujus suprad. civitatis rectores.* What is remarkable is that her son

Foundations of Alberic's power.

The dominion of Alberic therefore rested mainly on the aristocracy; its most secure foundation was the power of his own family. His father's services were not forgotten; his father, however, in his later days had become an enemy of Rome, and had always been an intruder, and the young prince was therefore never spoken of as the son of Alberic, but always as the son of Marozia. For Marozia was for some time the head of the family which was afterwards named the Tusculan, and it was essentially from her that Alberic inherited his power. The house of Marozia (she herself disappears from history, and her end is unknown) embraced through marriage-alliances many other families in the city and its territory. Alberic, powerful in Rome through his wealth, his vassals and the possession of S. Angelo, attracted the other nobles by the hope of the common advantage of independence. He endowed them with the highest offices in the administration, and perhaps also with property belonging to the Church. The circle of those on whom the government devolved, or who possessed a right to take part in public affairs, could now be determined. All definite information regarding Alberic's institutions, however, fails us. We hear neither of a Senate on the Capitol, nor of new magistrates. Neither Patricius nor Prefect is named, for Alberic united the authority of both in his own person. Neither can we suppose the existence of

Leo calls himself *ill. Senator*. Other women of the same family were: Maria, Theodora Senatrix (*A.* 1055), Ageltruda *Comtissa et Senatrix* (*A.* 1064). I have obtained these data from the collection of diplomas of Gaeta.

any civic constitution in the sense of later times. Nobles and burghers had not yet appeared in the light of opposing factions, and it was only out of such an opposition that these constitutions arose. In a city without trade and without industries, a city filled and ruled by priests, there could scarcely be a burgher class. It possessed only clergy, nobles and populace. The cultivated and active middle class, upon which civic freedom and power depend, was absent in Rome. We have read attentively the documents of the period to try to discover some traces of the life of the Roman burgher. We have here and there found witnesses adduced with the epithet of their industries, such as *lanista*, *opifex*, *candicator*, *sutor*, *negotiator*. The thought never occurred to the wool-worker, the goldsmith, the blacksmith, the artisan or the merchant, that he also had a right to a share in the civic government. Only on the occasion of the papal election did the burghers raise their voices in acclamation. They assembled in the scholae or artes, which continued to exist under their Priors, to discuss matters touching their own interests. They were dependent on the nobles, whose clients, like the coloni or farmers, they often were, and who stood to them in the oppressive relationship of patrons and creditors. The new ruler of Rome must, however, have bestowed privileges upon them connected with their guilds. The lower class, lastly, though essentially dependent on the Church and its liberality, was glad to change its ruler, and willingly obeyed a Roman prince, who was powerful, young, liberal, and of handsome and

commanding presence.[1] And since otherwise in the disturbed condition of affairs Alberic would never have been able to retain his authority so long, the iron hand of the young ruler repressed the tumults and protected the burghers against the oppression of the powerful.

In order to strengthen his position, he was obliged to direct his attention chiefly to the organisation of the military power. The militia of Rome still existed as scholae, as is shown by the formula retained in contracts, where the tenant is forbidden to transfer real estate to religious places or to the *numerus, seu bandus militum.* Alberic secured the adhesion of the city militia by taking it under his management and pay. He strengthened and organised it afresh, and perhaps to him was due a new division of the city into twelve regions each of which comprised a militia regiment under a standard-bearer. As we shall presently see, the city militia gained increased importance after his time. He made use of this force to defend himself against the intrigues of the hostile clergy and the jealous nobles, as well as against Hugo's attempts. The Roman nobility, clergy and people took the oath of obedience, and henceforth this intrepid man appears as monarch of the city and of the territory belonging to it.

[1] *Albericus princeps omnium Romanor. vultum nitentem sicut pater ejus, grandevus virtus ejus. Erat enim terribilis nimis, et aggrabatum est jugum super Romanos, et in s. sedis apostolice.*—Bened. of Soracte, c. 32. It is evident from diplomas that the corporations still survived; a diploma of 978 is signed by a *Stephano priore candicatore testis* (Galletti, *Del Prim.*, p. 214, n. 18).

His diplomas were dated, according to custom, with the pontificate and year of the Pope; the papal money, however, was stamped with his name, as it had formerly been with the name of the Emperor.[1] The extent of his power is no less recognisable in his judicial acts. It had been previously the custom to hold courts of justice in the Lateran or Vatican, in presence of the Pope, the Emperor, or the Imperial Missi. No sooner, however, had Alberic deprived the Pope of the temporal power, than the tribunal of the Princeps of Rome became the highest judicial court. The Princeps continued to hold courts of justice at various places; Alberic's judiciary authority.

[1] The first coin of Alberic (previously unknown) was discovered a few years ago in the Tiber, and has not yet been scientifically appreciated. It is now in the Vatican Cabinet, and is noticed for the first time in a Catalogue of the auction of the Collezione Rossi di Roma, Rome, 1880, n. 3746, and illustration on tav. vii. ALBRC. PRICIP. FIERI—JV.; *Rev.* SCS. PETRVS. In the field a cross, with I.P.O.E., the monogram of John XI., at the ends. The vigorous phrase, *Fieri Jussit*, is very characteristic as the expression of Alberic's princely power. We are acquainted, besides this, with coins of Alberic of the time of Marinus II. and Agapitus II. (Promis, p. 87 f.). The first has SCS. PETRVS, in the middle the monogram MARIN; *Rev.* ALBERI PRI, in the middle ROMA. The two coins of Agapitus have, the one: AGAPVS in monogram, around it ALBERICUS; *Rev.* SCS. PETRVS, with his bust; the other: AGAPITVS PA, in the middle the bust of Peter; *Rev.* SCS. PETRVS, and the monogram ALBR. Provana (*Studi Critici*, p. 143) with Carli, Scheidius and Argelati, strangely reads *Patricius* in the monogram AGAPVS. I have examined these coins in the Vatican Cabinet, in the presence of the Director, Signor Tassieri, and, like Promis, read *Agapus*. The erroneous inference of Provana, that Alberic had resigned a share of power to Agapitus, consequently falls to the ground. See my treatise: *Die Münzen Alberich's, des Fürsten und Senators der Römer, Sitzungsber. der Baier. Akad. der Wissensch.*, 1885.

but it is significant of the change of affairs that he also instituted a tribunal in his own palace. Although he owned the palace on the Aventine which had been his birthplace, he nevertheless dwelt in the Via Lata, beside the Church of the Apostles, and apparently on the spot now occupied by the Palazzo Colonna, whose owners (the present Colonna family) claim the Princeps as their ancestor. We have already spoken of this quarter as the most aristocratic in the city. It was the quarter of the nobility, the most animated part of Rome, and was surrounded by magnificent ruins, not only those of the Baths of Constantine, but those also of the Forum of Trajan, and was adjoined by the Via Lata, which included the upper part of the present Corso.

A document which still exists records a placitum held by Alberic in his palace. On August 17, 942, Leo, Abbot of Subiaco, appeared before him in a dispute concerning the monastery. The following were the judges of Alberic's Curia: Marinus, Bishop of Polimartium and Bibliothecarius, the Primicerius Nicholas, the Secundicerius George, the Arcarius Andrew, the Saccellarius, the Protoscrinarius of the Apostolic Chair, together with the most prominent nobles of the city; Benedict called Campanino (that is to say, Count in the Campagna), probably a relation of Alberic,[1] Kaloleo, the Dux Gregorius de Cannapara,

[1] In 1005 he is spoken of as dead, and as having bestowed property in Trastevere on the Monastery of S. Cosma e Damiano: *quemadmod. Benedictus bon. mem. qui dicebatur Campaninus pro sua anima denavit.* (Bull of John XVIII. for this convent, March 29, 1005, in the *Cod.*

the Vestararius Theophylact, the Superista John, Demetrius son of Meliosus, Balduin, Franco, Gregory of the Aventine, Benedict Miccino, Crescentius, Benedict de Flumine, Benedict de Leone de Ata, the Dux Adrian, Benedict, the son of Sergius, and others.[1] Two distinct classes of judges are here evident. To the first class belonged, as previously, the ministers of the Papal Palace, prelates, who soon after the time of Alberic were called *judices ordinarii*. The Princeps of the Romans thus accepted the Papal organisation of justice unaltered. The second class was formed as before by the city nobility, who now, however, appeared as Curiales or courtiers of the Prince. These nobles were obliged to appear at these courts of justice as assessors, a duty which was often very irksome. Permanent assessors, such as the French *Scabini* or the later *Judices Dativi*, did not as yet exist. The "optimates" were therefore actual judges who pronounced sentence, or were present in the capacity of *boni homines*.[2]

Vat. 7931.) It is probable that this man was the Comes Benedictus, husband of the Senatrix Stephania. In the same bull, property outside the *porta Pancratii* is designated as belonging to the house of Theophylact: *casale de Stephano et Theophilacto germanis*, *casale de Maroza olim profetissa* (for *prefetissa*).

[1] *A. iv. Pont. Dom. Stephani VIII. P. P. Ind. XV. m. Aug. die* 17. Now printed in the *Regesto Sublacense* (Rome, 1885), p. 202. Benedictus is the first known Count of the Campagna; this county had been introduced by the Popes when they became masters of Latium. It corresponded to the Praesidium of the province in ancient times.

[2] It is signed by nine assessors; one thus: *Balduinum nobilem virum interf.* The frequently recurring *nobilis vir* is probably equivalent to the *bonus homo*, the *Rachimburgius* of the Franks, or *prud'homme*; for to such German noblemen corresponded in Rome the *nobiles viri*.

3. Alberic's Moderation—Hugo repeatedly besieges Rome—His Daughter Alda marries Alberic—Alberic's Relations with Byzantium—Leo VII., 936—Retrospect of Benedictine Monasticism—Its Decay—The Reform of Cluny—Alberic's energy regarding it—Odo of Cluny in Rome—Continuation of the History of Farfa—The Sabine Province.

Alberic's energetic rule.

None of the vices which disgraced his mother and King Hugo have ever been laid to Alberic's charge; and if he awoke the ire of the chroniclers, it was solely because he deprived the Pope of the temporal government, kept him a prisoner, and apparently tyrannised over the Church.[1] The partisans of German Imperial power denounced him as a usurper. Nevertheless his dominion was in no way a usurpation as regards the Empire, for the Empire was at the time extinct; nor did the King of Italy possess any claim over Rome. If in the time of Gregory II., when a legitimate emperor still reigned, the Romans (among whom the tradition of the republic or the rights of Imperial election still lingered) arrogated to themselves the power of altering the Government and of transferring it to the Pope, now, when there was no longer an emperor, they held themselves all the more entitled to assume the same privilege. Rome had not been presented to the Popes by either

[1] Hence Liutprand, *Legatio*, c. 62: *Verum cum impiissimus Albericus, quem non stillatim cupiditas, sed velut torrens, impleverat, Romanam civitatem sibi usurparet, dominumque apostolicum quasi servum proprium in conclavi teneret.*

Pipin or Charles; it had surrendered itself willingly into their hands. The Carolingian Imperial constitution, which recognised the territorial power of the Popes, had fallen with the Imperium. The Romans now again resumed their ancient right, untroubled by the thought that the Popes had acquired rights over the city, not only such as had been given by time, but yet more by the thousand glorious works which had made new Rome the creation of the Church. The Romans, therefore, as they had elected a Pope, now from among themselves elected a prince, to whom they transferred the temporal power, as formerly they had transferred it to the Pope.

Forced by circumstances to moderation, Alberic contented himself with dominion over the city and its territory, so far as the territory stood in his power. He bore the modest but dignified title of "Prince and Senator of all the Romans," without allowing himself to be dazzled by higher ambitions; for in order to acquire the title of Emperor of the Romans, it was necessary first to gain possession of the Crown of the Lombard kingdom. Instead, however, of striving to wrest this crown from Hugo, as an adventurer would have done, he wisely restricted himself to the consolidation of his power in Rome, and scarcely at any other time has the city enjoyed peace and security such as that which it enjoyed during the long reign of Alberic.

Hugo besieges Rome in 933 and 936.

Hugo's desire for revenge was foreseen. In 933 he came with an army, burning with impatience to punish the city, to claim the rights which his marriage with Marozia had given him, and to obtain the

Imperial crown. Although he attacked the walls day after day, he was obliged to withdraw without having achieved any result, and to satisfy himself with laying waste the Campagna.[1] He returned in 936 and was equally unsuccessful. His army was thinned by pestilence, and he found himself at length obliged to make peace with Alberic, Odo of Cluny probably acting as mediator.[2] Hugo condescended to give Alda, his legitimate daughter, in marriage to his invincible step-son. He hoped by this alliance to draw the brave Roman into his power. But he deceived himself; for although Alberic probably brought his royal betrothed into the city he did not bring his father-in-law, to whose rebellious vassals, however, he accorded an asylum in Rome. His efforts to obtain the hand of a Greek princess having proved unavailing, he now married Alda. The chronicler of Soracte relates that he had sent Benedict of the Campagna as his envoy to Constantinople, and had prepared his palace for the reception of a Greek bride. But this marriage, says the chronicler, never took place.[3] Alberic

Alberic marries Hugo's daughter Alda.

[1] *Collecta multitudine proficiscitur Romam; cujus quamquam loca et provincias circum circa misere devastaret, eamque ipsam quotidiano impetu impugnaret, ingrediendi eam tamen effectum obtinere non potuit.* Liutpr., iv. c. 2. Flodoard, *Chron.*, *A.* 993: *Hugo R. Italiae Romam obsidet.*

[2] Flodoard, *A.* 936. Liutpr., iv. c. 3. *Vita S. Odonis*, Surius vi. 18. Nov. II. c. 5. II. c. 7: *cum Romuleam urbem propter inimicitias, quae ei erant cum Alberico principe, Hugo rex—obsideret, vir sanctus et intra et extra urbem discurrens, hortabatur eos ad mutuam pacem*, &c.

[3] *Consilio iniit Albericus principes, ut de sanguine Graecor. imperator., sibi uxore sociandam. Transmissus Benedictus Campaniam* (it is *Bened. Campanino;* the chronicler was well informed) *a Constantin-*

undoubtedly made advances to the Greek Court, seeking to win recognition as prince and to acquire importance by an alliance so illustrious. After the fall of the Western Empire the Byzantine ruler had again become formidable. The successes of the Greeks brought them nearer to Rome, and the Emperors of the East had never ceased to regard themselves as lawful Roman Emperors. Alliance with the Eastern Court would have lent Alberic support against Hugo; and Byzantium might have consented, had the ruler of Rome humbled himself to become its Patricius. The date of these negotiations is uncertain; the negotiations themselves are obscure, and we only know that Alberic strove to acquire the favour of the Emperor Romanus, and forced the Pope to concede the use of the pallium to the Byzantine patriarch Theophylact, son of the Emperor, although Theophylact's successors in the Patriarchate were not to sue for the Papal permission. This uncanonical concession reveals the policy of Alberic, but does not prove that he wished to render Rome again subject to the Greek yoke. Rather were his negotiations shattered by Hugo's intrigues, and by his own refusal to betray Rome.[1]

Pope John XI. died in January 936, after having spent five inglorious years, restricted to his spiritual office and under his brother's watchful

opolim, ut perficeret omnia, qualiter sibi sociandos esset, &c. *Verumtamen ad thalamum nuptiis non pervenit, c.* 34.

[1] Concerning the concession of the pallium, see Liutprand, *Legatio*, c. 62. Hugo effected a marriage between Romanus II. and his beautiful illegitimate daughter Bertha in 943. He had sent Liutprand's father to Byzantium as early as 927.

eye.[1] The ruler of Rome now forced a Benedictine monk to accept the tiara.[2] The yielding disposition of Leo VII. made him a serviceable Pope in the hands of Alberic, and, renouncing as he did the temporal power, the relations between Prince and Pope remained harmonious. Leo, suppressing a sigh, called his tyrant and patron "the merciful Alberic, his beloved spiritual son, and the most glorious prince of the Romans."[3] The historian Flodoard dedicates some grateful verses to Leo, because the Pope had accorded him a friendly reception. Flodoard praised him as a priest should be praised, as a pious man who strove after God and despised worldly things, and the historian does not allude to Alberic by one single syllable.[4] He thus made a virtue of necessity.

Leo VII., Pope, 936–939.

The shrewd Prince of the Romans had placed a pious monk in S. Peter's Chair, and there caused him to distinguish himself by his apostolic virtues. Pope

[1] *Vi vacuus, splendore carens, modo sacra ministrans,*
Fratre a Patricio juris moderamine rapto,
Qui matrem incestam rerum fastigia moecho
Tradere conantem decimum sub claustra Joannem
Quae dederat, claustri vigili et custode subegit.—Flodoard.

[2] That the consecration of Leo VII. took place before Jan. 9, 936, is shown by Pagi from his bull, *V. Id. Jan. Ind. XI. A. Pont. III.* (Mabill., *Annal.* iii. 708).

[3] *Misericors Albericus—noster spiritualis filius et gloriosus Princeps Romanor. Reg. Subl.* 45, col. 2., *A.* 937, of which further.

[4] *Septimus exsurgit Leo, nec tamen ista volutans,*
Nec curans apices mundi, nec celsa requirens,
Sola Dei quae sunt alacri sub pectore volvens,
Culminaque evitans, oblata subire renutans,
Raptus ab erigitur, dignusque nitore probatur
Regminis eximii, Petrisque in sede locatur, etc.

Flodoard ends his *Vitae Pont.* with Leo V.

and Prince together strove to restore cloistral discipline, and we must therefore bestow a glance on monasticism.

After a period of great activity Benedictine Monasticism falls to decay.

In the course of four centuries the institution of Benedict had accomplished its work in the history of civilisation and had now fallen into decay. Its mission had consisted in helping to form the new Christian society. In the midst of barbarian nations Benedictine monks had represented in their communities an orderly, if one-sided society, whose form was that of a family under the guidance of a father, and united by principles of authority and love. The law books of civic life had perished; but the Benedictines had written a new code of civil law, and the rule of Benedict was the most ancient law book of the Middle Ages. Thus the seeds of a society of brotherly love were sown in the midst of barbarism. While the world was reduced to a smoking cinder-heap, these societies led peaceable, industrious and holy lives. They displayed a realm of moral ideals to the rude nations around, a realm where temporal wants were unknown, and where obedience and humility flourished. With Apostolic zeal they converted the heathen. Under their guidance the gospel aided the sword of Charles in the conquest of new provinces, and in extending the confines of the Church. Their convents were the refuges of misfortune and guilt, and at the same time the honoured colonies of learning, the only schools left to the impoverished human race, the asylum where the last remains of classic culture found shelter. Their dreams or ideas were lost to sight in the furthest

distance of heaven. Nevertheless they sowed and reaped and gathered the fruits of the earth into spacious granaries. Since they themselves possessed estates, and laboured in the field according to the practical rule of Benedict, they became founders of cities and colonies, and numberless tracts of land owed their cultivation, inhabitants and prosperity to Benedictine energy.[1] The order accomplished a great work of civilisation by the social principle of Christian love, by schools, by agriculture, by the foundation of towns, by a thousand peaceful means in the midst of rude, opposing forces, and by the association of secular elements with the Church. The glorious mission which the institution of Benedict thus achieved secures it a foremost place in the annals of mankind. In spite of the many reformations which followed in after times, in spite of the new and in part famous orders which arose, no society ever attained either the Christian virtues or the social importance of Benedict's foundation, for all obeyed some special impulse, were at the service of the Church, and were the outcome of some tendency of the time.

The rapid decay of the Benedictines was everywhere closely connected with the decline of the Empire and the Papacy. The ruin of both sprang from the same source. Monasticism, however, more

[1] Of this we have innumerable examples in every country. I content myself with one. The visitor to Monte Casino, who has the villages on the surrounding mountains pointed out to him by name, will be surprised to find so many called after saints. They are all foundations of the monastery: S. Germano, S. Pietro in Fine, S. Elia, S. Angelo, S. Pietro in Curris, S. Giorgio, S. Apollinare, S. Ambrogio, S. Andrea, S. Vittore.

than ecclesiastical or political institutions, bore in itself an essential germ of dissolution. No sooner had secular considerations assumed the foremost place in consequence of the new political order, of which Charles had been the founder, than the latent opposition between spiritual and temporal elements showed its power. After a long period of renunciation, the human mind, forsaking the mystic spheres beyond, again took possession of the world which monasticism had despised. While the realities of life claimed their rights, they entered into the harshest opposition to the religious ideal of virtue and produced the most hideous caricatures. The tenth, like the fifteenth, century reveals society in a state of violent ferment. It is not, however, the historian's duty to trace the process of thought. Rather may he point out how the decay of monasticism set in with the wealth of the monasteries, and how it arose out of the dignities and offices in Church and State, which fostered the ambition of the monks, who won great influence at the royal courts, and even ascended S. Peter's Chair. In possession of incalculable wealth, the monasteries had been converted into principalities, the Abbots into Counts; and Charles the Great had already set the fatal example of bestowing abbeys upon secular barons. The estates of these abbeys were squandered on the relations, friends and vassals of the Abbots, and were soon seized by a thousand greedy robbers. Egotism, the increasing love of pleasure, the inconceivable corruption produced by the spirit of faction, were, however, no more responsible for the want of discipline than the insecurity of

political conditions. The repeated sacks of the convents by Hungarians and Saracens dealt them their death-blow. Many abbeys were destroyed, and the monks were scattered. Where the monasteries remained standing, their rules had fallen into disuse, and monasticism was disintegrated, as was also the canonical constitution of the secular clergy which had once been a matter of so much concern to Lewis the Pious.

No sooner, however, had the decay of these institutions reached its uttermost limit, than a remarkable religious reaction set in. Holy men, rising apparently out of the dust of S. Benedict, suddenly appeared to support the falling heaven of Christianity. In the midst of the universal dread of the approaching end of the world, a new impulse to asceticism was awakened. Out of the chaos of licentious passion penitent love rose triumphant. Founders of orders, hermits, penitents, enthusiastic as those of the ancient Thebaid, sprang from the soil. Missionaries and martyrs wandered from end to end of the wild Slav country, princes and tyrants veiled themselves again in the cowl of the monks, and piety began to illumine the darkest century of the Church's history as the radiance of stars illuminates the darkness of some cheerless night.

The Cluniac reform of Monasticism.

The Benedictine reform originated in France, where Berno founded his celebrated monastery in Cluny about the year 910, William, Duke of Aquitaine, having presented him with the villa Cluniacum for the purpose. The order of monasticism revived by Berno on the foundation of the Benedictine rule spread

rapidly over Europe. Berno was, however, soon surpassed by his pupil Odo, the Abbot, who, as missionary of monastic reform, travelled from land to land. Henceforward the rule of Cluny began to govern the spiritual world. Its influence has been well likened to that exercised by the later Jesuits at royal courts. The system of Cluny, equally with that of Loyola, was calculated to concentrate the moral world under the dominion of the Pope. Thus even in her times of greatest distress the Church has never failed to develop from within forces capable of investing her with a new life. The order of Cluny is the first link in the long chain of spiritual militant orders which reaches down to latest times.

Odo of Cluny.

Odo was highly honoured by King Hugo, not less so by Alberic. He came several times to Rome, where Leo VII. and Alberic employed him to restore cloistral discipline. In 936 they made over to him the Abbey of S. Paul, the buildings of which were falling to ruin, and whose monks had either deserted or were living a life of license. Odo introduced other brethren and placed at their head Baldwin of Monte Casino (a monastery which he had already reformed).[1] In 939 Alberic made over to Odo the Suppentine[2]

[1] Mabillon, *Annal. Ben.*, iii. 432.

[2] [In both the German and Italian editions the word is printed Suppontine. This word, which was not found in any dictionary or Church history, and which seemed to defy all explanation, proved a source of great perplexity. The late Signor Bonghi, Minister of Education in Italy, however, kindly sent the following solution: "The Suppontino of Gregorovius," he wrote, "is a title added to the convent of S. Elia. The building is situated on a steep cliff, at the foot of which rushes a torrent that flows into the Treja. It is believed that from this cliff is derived the word *Suppentonia*,

monastery of S. Elias in Roman Tuscany, presented him with his own palace near SS. Alexius and Bonifacius, for the purpose of founding a monastery. Thus arose the convent of S. Maria—a monument of the celebrated Roman, and a building which, as the Priory of Malta, still exists on the Aventine.[1] Alberic, moreover, appointed Odo Archimandrite of all the cenobite communities within Roman territory. The chronicle of Farfa, which records the fact, makes no mention of the Pope, who stood in the background behind the Prince. The convents of S. Lorenzo and S. Agnese also owed their reform on the system of Cluny to Alberic.[2] The Prince of Rome carefully enquired into the condition of all abbeys and bishoprics that stood "under his dominion." Their ruin, which entailed the impoverishment of the peasant and the ruin of agriculture, could be to him no matter of indifference. He strove to uphold the power of the monasteries, in order that he might fill them with adherents of his own, who helped to impose a check on the refractory nobility. He also befriended the monastery of Subiaco in 937, confirming the privi-

S. Maria on the Aventine.

the name given to the convent by S. Gregory in his Dialogues. A mediaeval document speaks of it as *Monasterium . . . in Pentonia*; and three authors, Tomasetti (*Campagna Romana*), Ranghiasca and Moroni, when writing of the convent, make use of the same terms."—Translator.]

[1] Constructio Farf., p. 536: *suamque domum propriam ubi ipse natus est Romae positam in Aventino monte concessit ad monast. construendum quod usque hodie* (beginning of saec. xi.) *stare videtur in honore S. Mariae.* Aligern, Abbot of Monte Casino after Baldwin, came from this convent in 1013; Aimo is mentioned as *Abbate monast. S. Marie que ponitur in Aventino* (Mittarelli, *Annal. Camald.*, App. 206).

[2] *Constr. Farf. Bened. of Soracte*, c. 33.

leges of John X., who had bestowed upon it the possession of Castrum Sublacense, where through his bailiff the Abbot now exercised jurisdiction. He confirmed the same abbot in possession of the deserted convent of S. Erasmus on the Coelian, and henceforward this monastery permanently remained united to the monastery of Subiaco.[1]

In its neighbourhood stood the Abbey of Andrew and Gregory, a building which we only mention as forming the subject of Alberic's most celebrated charter. Alberic presented Castel Mazzano with all its belongings and coloni to the Abbot Benedict on January 14, 945. This place, then a family possession of Alberic, stood in the diocese of Nepi, where Sergius, brother of the prince, was bishop. A copy of the precious document, which was signed by all the members of the family of the Senator of the Romans, has been preserved by a happy accident,[2] and the

[1] The Bull of John X., *VI. Id. Maji. Ann. Pont. III. Ind. IV.—per man. Marini Ep. S. Polimartiensis Eccl. et Biblioth.* Diploma of Leo VII. *per interventun Alberici gloriosi Principis atque omn. Romanor. Senatoris*, in which he confirms the Abbot Leo in possession of the convent of S. Erasmus already presented to him by John X., *V. Id. Febr. Ind. XI., A.* 936. Confirmation of *Castrum Subl. IV. Non. Aug. A. Pont. II. Ind. X.*, 937. The reader will now find all these documents, which I took from the *Cod. Sessor.*, in the *Regesto Sublacense* (Rome, 1885).

[2] I have already referred to this document. † *Albericus Princeps atq. om. Rom. Senator hinc a die presentis donationis cartula de suprascriptis immobilibus locis et familiis cum eorum pertinentiis facta a me cum meis consortibus in suprascripto Monasterio in perpetuum, sicut superius legitur, manu propria subscripsi, et testes qui subscriberent rogavi.*

Signum † manu suprascripta Marozza nobilissima femina donatrice qui supra Lra † n.

tyrant of Rome thus appears in a new light, as the zealous promoter of monasticism. Legend further ascribes the foundation of the convent of SS. Stephen and Cyriacus near S. Maria in Via Lata to his sisters.[1]

Condition of Farfa.

But nowhere was the reform more necessary than in Farfa. The celebrated monastery, which the Popes had in vain striven to bring under their rule, no longer enjoyed the protection of an Emperor, since Emperor at this time there was none. The ruler of Rome, however, now regarded himself as overlord of Farfa.

We have already spoken of the decline of the abbey and must now continue its history. The Abbot Roffred had rebuilt Farfa, and as a reward had been murdered in 936 by two of his monks, Campo and Hildebrand. Campo, a noble Sabine, had come to the monastery while a youth, to be instructed in grammar and medicine by the Abbot. The pupil gave tangible proof of his proficiency in the latter art by the efficacy with which he prepared a cup of poison for his benefactor.[2] By means of gifts, he acquired the dignity of Abbot from King Hugo, and together with Hildebrand now entered on a life of dissolute enjoyment. In a year they were adversaries. Hildebrand, banished from the monastery, proclaimed

Signum † manu suprascripta Stephania, etc.
Berta nobilissima puella, etc.
Sergius Dei gr. Episcop. S. Nepesine Eccl., etc.

Constantinus in Dei nom. nobilis vir., etc. A *fundus Nzanus* near Vegi is mentioned in the epitaph of two children of Theophylact spoken of above: it was probably connected with Mazzano.

[1] Martinelli, *Primo Trofeo*, etc., p. 57 *sq.*

[2] The dying abbot humorously exclaimed: *Campigenas Campo, male quam me campigenasti!—Hugo of Farfa*, p. 535.

himself Abbot in the conventual estate of the March of Fermo, and Farfa remained divided for years. Both men had wives, and by Liuza Campo had also become the father of seven daughters and three sons, whom he brought up in princely luxury. Under the guise of leases and contracts he squandered the monastic estates on his followers and soldiers, and assumed the position of a prince in the Sabina. Hildebrand pursued the same course at Fermo. One day the latter invited his mistresses, sons and daughters and knights to a feast at his residence, S. Victoria. The castle caught fire while the company was in a state of intoxication. Countless treasures brought by Hildebrand from Farfa were destroyed. The monks had followed the example of the Abbot; each of them had married a mistress according to the rites of the Church.[1] They no longer dwelt in the monastery; each had his villa, and they were accustomed to meet at Farfa on Sundays to exchange their jovial greetings. They had robbed the monastery of all its valuables. They had even carried off the gold seals from the Imperial diplomas and replaced them by others of lead. The consecrated vestments of brocade had been converted into dresses for their mistresses, the altar vessels into earrings and ornaments. This state of things lasted for half a century. As soon, however, as Hugo left him free in the Sabina, Alberic strove to suppress these disorders and to bring the province under subjection to Rome. Odo found full occupation at Farfa. He sent monks to introduce

[1] *Destructio Farf.*, p. 535, and the *Chron. Farf.*, which frequently agrees with it word for word.

the rule of Cluny; Campo, however, refused to receive them, and after an attempt had been made to strangle the brethren by night in their beds, they effected their escape to Rome. Hereupon Alberic himself marched with the militia to the Abbey. He expelled the Abbot, installed the brethren of Cluny, and entrusted the convent to Dagobert of Cumae, with orders that everything of which it had been deprived should be restored. These events took place in 947. But in the course of five years the new Abbot was poisoned; the former disgraceful state of things was renewed, and lasted, with some interruptions, until, under the Ottos, the monastery again arrests our attention.[1]

Alberic also reformed the monastery of S. Andrew on Soracte, thus extending his power over the Sabina. This territory had hitherto belonged to Spoleto, but appears to have been afterwards severed from the province. For in 939 we find rectors of the Sabina, who were indifferently called dux, comes, or marchio. The Lombard Ingebald, husband of Theodoranda, a daughter of the Roman Consul Gratianus, meets our notice as the first rector of the district in 939.[2]

The Sabina.

[1] The monk who had poisoned Dagobert made a pilgrimage to Garganus, but after having striven in vain for a whole year to climb the mountain he disappeared. *Destruct. Farf.*, p. 537.

[2] *Fatteschi*, Serie 248 and *Dipl.* 61. The district is, as a rule, called Territorium or Comitatus. These documents are dated with the rule of the Pope, of the Bishop, and of the Rector of the Sabina, *A.* 948 (n. 63): *Temporib. dom. Agapiti—PP. et Johannis Episcopi et Teuzonis Comitis Rectorisq. Territor. Sabin. mense Sept.* Nothing is ever dated from Alberic, but with the coronation of Otto I. the date of the Imperial reign is adopted. The Catalog. Imp. of the *Chron. Farfa* mentions Leo as first *Dux Sabinensis*; after him Azo, Joseph, Teuzo.

4. Stephen VIII., Pope, 939—Alberic suppresses a revolt — Marinus II., Pope, 942 — Hugo again lays siege to Rome — He is overthrown by Berengar of Ivrea—Lothar, King of Italy—Peace between Hugo and Alberic—Agapitus II., Pope, 946—Berengar, King of Italy, 950—The Italians summon Otto the Great — Alberic refuses to admit him to Rome — Berengar becomes his Vassal—Death of Alberic, 954.

Meanwhile Leo VII. had died in July 939 and had been succeeded by the Roman Stephen VIII.,[1] a Pope of whose reign history scarcely speaks, since under Alberic's rule the pontiffs did little more than give their names to bulls. A solitary voice informs us that Stephen, mutilated in some insurrection, had hidden his humiliation in misanthropic solitude; and the statement, even if a fable, throws a light on the conception of mankind as to what the Popes were in those days.[2] Stephen VIII., 939–942.

Stephen VIII. owed his elevation to Alberic. If, as was afterwards supposed, he had been so cruelly ill-treated by the followers, or actually by the orders of the prince, we may infer that he had joined in some conspiracy against him. Nevertheless, when a conspiracy is spoken of, the Pope is not mentioned, and Alberic quashes a revolt.

It continues the series down to 1084. I shall show that the Crescentii there made themselves hereditary counts.

[1] The length of Stephen's rule (*a.* 3 *m.* 3. *d.* 15) is given in the *Cod. Vat.* 1340, from which Georgius, on Baronius *A.* 939, concludes that he was consecrated before July 19.

[2] Martin. Polonus and Baron. Contemporary writers know nothing of it.

among the conspirators punished by Alberic, Stephen's name does not appear. That attempts to overthrow the ruler had been made in Rome is, however, evident. The clergy, whose power he had usurped, and many envious nobles gave ear to Hugo's agents and accepted their bribes. The chronicler of Soracte suddenly draws a veil over these occurrences. He allows us, however, to perceive a conspiracy at the head of which stood the Bishops Benedict and Marius. Alberic's own sisters also seem to have been privy to the plot. One of them, as the monk informs us, betrayed the scheme, and the guilty were punished by death, imprisonment or scourging.[1] The strong arm of Alberic successfully controlled both clergy and nobility; no Pope dared stretch forth his hand towards the temporal power during his lifetime. The Vicars of Christ obediently ascended the Papal throne and silently passed from it.

Marinus II., Pope, 942–946.

On the death of Stephen VIII. (942), Alberic appointed Marinus to the Papacy.[2] This shadow of a Pope lived more than three years, timidly obeying the commands of the Prince, "without which the gentle, peace-loving man dared do nothing."[3] Alberic

[1] *Benedict of Soracte*, c. 34. *Annal. Saxo ad A.* 941: *Corruptis cunctis optimatib., maximeque Romanis Judicib., quib. omnia venalia sunt.*

[2] Three years 6 months and 13 days are given to Marinus II. Arguing from Ughelli VIII. 50 (3 *Id. Nov. ann. Pont. Marini II., Ind. II. i.e.* 943), concerning which Mansi refers to Baronius *ad A.* 943, Jaffé believes this consecration to have taken place before Nov. 11. In the *Reg. Subl.*, fol. 12, *Cod. Sessor.* ccxvii. p. 69, the first year of the pontificate is designated: *anno Do. p. Marini—II. PP., in sede I., Ind. I., m. April. die* 15; therefore the same year 943.

[3] *Electus Marinus papa non audebat adtingere aliquis extra jussio Alberici principi.—Ben. of Soracte*, c. 32.

triumphantly withstood the continued attempts of Hugo, who unweariedly strove to reach the Imperial Crown shut up within S. Peter's. As early as 931, he had nominated Lothar his youthful son as king to reign jointly with himself, and in order to strengthen his position, had married Bertha, wiow of Rudolf II. of Burgundy, to whose daughter, the afterwards celebrated Adelaide, he had betrothed his son. He sought a closer alliance with the Byzantines, but in spite of his having filled the highest episcopal and other appointments with his Burgundian followers, his throne in Italy remained insecure. Men regarded his cunning and tyrannical policy with hatred. The Lombard nobility were wearied of him, and his unsuccessful undertakings against Rome diminished his prestige.

Hugo besieges Rome, 941.

In 941 he again appeared before the city, and made his head-quarters beside S. Agnese.[1] It is possible that he spent the entire winter before the walls, while within the city Odo of Cluny sought to negotiate a peace. Neither threats, force, nor insidious promises availed to open the gates. The Romans remained faithful to Alberic. They beheld the towns and villages of their territory ruthlessly laid waste, but continued staunch, and the historian Liutprand marvels at the failure not only of Hugo's efforts,

[1] A donation of Hugo to Subiaco is dated from 7 *Kal. Julii A.* 941, *Ind. XIV.*, in the 15th year of Hugo, in the 10th of Lothar: *actum juxta Romam in Monasterio S. Virginis Agnes. Murat. Annal.*, 941. I add further a document for the convent of S. Bened. in Telle, in the Marsian territory, dated 6 *Kal. Julias—Actum Romae.* Archives of M. Casino, cap. 12, n. 8. The seal is lacking to the diploma, which has not been edited by Gattula.

but also of his bribes, and is forced to attribute the resistance of venal Rome to some mysterious divine decree.

The city was at length and for ever released from Hugo. A storm burst over Lombardy which he found himself unable to subdue. In spite of all his efforts he had not succeeded in quelling the hostile nobles. Berengar of Ivrea, son of Adalbert, had been married to Hugo's niece, Willa, the daughter of Boso. The King hoped by this union to entrap the powerful Margrave, but Berengar, by flight, avoided the net which was laid for him, and sought refuge, first with the Duke of Swabia, and afterwards with Otto, the German King. No sooner did he know the soil of Italy to be sufficiently undermined beneath Hugo's feet than he returned in 945. Several bishops boldly declared for him. Milan opened her gates. The Lombards deserted Hugo's flag to receive bishoprics and dignities from a new autocrat. Hugo, however, sent his popular son to Milan, to entreat the nobles to leave him (Lothar) at least the crown; and so wavering was the policy of the Italians, that they agreed to support him in opposition to Berengar.[1] Hugo, having avowed the intention of carrying off the treasures of the kingdom to Provence, Berengar in the name of the Lombards announced that they would recognise him as heretofore King of Italy. Hugo, returned, however, to Provence, leaving to his

Hugo is overthrown by Berengar.

[1] *Italienses autem semper geminis uti volunt dominis, ut alterum alterius terrore coerceant.* This celebrated saying of Liutprand (*Antapod.*, i. c. 37), which is transcribed by the *Chronicle of Farfa* (p. 416) has only now lost its force.

son Lothar the semblance of an Italian kingdom for some unfortunate years.

The sudden change in the aspect of affairs brought peace to Rome. Hugo renounced his claims in 946, and left the undisputed sovereignty in the city and territory to Alberic.[1] Henceforward the Prince of the Romans reigned in complete security, while the Pope, as hitherto, obeyed his commands. Marinus II. died in March 946 and was succeeded by Agapitus II. The new Pope, a Roman by birth and a prudent man, retained the pontificate for nearly ten years.[2] Under him the Papacy even began to reassert itself, and reappears as taking part in matters connected with foreign countries, matters in which, under the immediate predecessors of Agapitus, it had had no share. Events, moreover, were preparing the way for an entirely new order of things in Rome. The energy of German kings was to imbue utterly exhausted Italy with fresh life, and was to link the fate of the nation for many a century with the fortunes of the German kingdom.

Agapitus II., Pope, 946–955.

The young King Lothar died suddenly on No-

[1] *Flod. Chron. A.* 946. *Marinus Papa decessit, cui successit Agapitus: et pax inter Albericum Patricium et Hugonem Regem Italiae depaciscitur.* Hugo died in 947 in Provence.

[2] Georgius (Note to Baron., *A.* 946) shows that Agapitus had already entered on his pontificate in April, and Mansi (*ibidem*) tries to prove that he did so on March 8 (from Murat., *Ant. It.* iii. 146). In February 947, at any rate, the first year had not yet expired. *Anno primo Agapiti junior. PP. Ind. V. m. Febr. die III.*, *Cod. Sessor.* ccxvii. p. 71. On March 26, 949, he still reckoned his third year. *Ibid.*, p. 75: *anno III. Agap. II. Ind. VII. Mar. die* 26. Mansi's opinion is therefore mistaken. According to Jaffé (R. P. 2 Ed.), Agapitus was consecrated on May 10.

vember 22, 950, in Turin—a victim to fever or to poison administered by the Berengarians. With Lothar the Burgundian faction fell. The Italian national party arose, and resumed the attempt which had proved fatal alike to Guido, Lambert, and Berengar I. Berengar of Ivrea took the Lombard crown on December 15, and caused his son Adalbert to be crowned co-regent. Italy thus again possessed two native kings, the eyes of both of whom were turned to the distant Imperial crown. Berengar, in the hope of gaining over the Burgundian party, may probably have desired to effect a marriage between his son and the widow of Lothar, but whether he ever made any overtures for the union remains uncertain.[1] The beautiful widow of his predecessor on the throne of Italy was naturally the object of his jealousy. He consequently caused her to be imprisoned in Como on April 20, 951, and afterwards in a tower on the Lake of Garda. The brave woman, however, made her escape to Reggio, and sought refuge with Bishop Adalhard; and it is perhaps merely legend that the bishop placed her in the Castle of Canossa under the protection of Azzo or Adalbert. A sudden change of affairs took place. Adelaide, her adherents of Lothar's party, the enemies of Berengar (more especially the Milanese), Pope Agapitus, who, oppressed by Alberic in Rome, saw both Exarchate and Pentapolis in the power of Berengar, all turned their eyes to Germany, and instead of organising a national movement in

Berengar, King of Italy, Dec. 15, 950.

[1] *Jahrb. d. D. Gesch. Kaiser Otto der Grosse*, by Köpke-Dümmler (1876), p. 191 f.

their own country, they again summoned a foreigner to Italy.[1]

Otto summoned to Italy, 951.

Otto, renowned in war, in wisdom and in power, a second Charles the Great, came from Germany at the head of an armed force. The Lombard army under Berengar dispersed at his approach. He offered his hand to Adelaide, and married her at Pavia towards the end of the year 951, when the young Lombard queen, clasped in his powerful embrace, seemed to be the symbol of the Italy which yielded herself to him.

Amid fierce struggles with the Slavs, Hungarians and Danes, as well as with the dukes of German race, Otto's father, Henry I., a Saxon Duke had restored the east Frankish empire and created a powerful national state. Imperial ideas, however, survived the overthrow of the system of states created by Charles the Great, and in Otto I., who ascended the German throne in the year 936, these ideas found a hero capable of giving them realisation. Italy was dismembered and powerless. In civilisation and culture, however, far surpassing the half barbarian Germans, had she in the middle of the tenth century been able to put forward as her king a great native prince, such as Alberic, the expedition of Otto would never have succeeded.

Whether Agapitus's invitation to Otto was or was

[1] That the property of the Church also played a part, we are shown by the *Translatio S. Epiphanii* (*Mon. Germ.*, vi. c. 1) *ut Berengarius—jus fasque quaque confundens, aliquantum etiam de terminis S. Petri praedatoria vi sibi arripere praesumpsisset*, on which account the Pope invited Otto.

not sent with the knowledge of Alberic remains uncertain. We assume, however, that he was privy to the matter. The Princeps of the Romans, foreseeing, as he must have done, that the King of Italy would renew Hugo's attempts against Rome, must have desired the weakening of Berengar's power. Neither Alberic nor anyone could, however, foresee the results of Otto's expedition. The German King had crossed the Alps under the pretext of making a pilgrimage to Rome. He intended to shape his plans in accordance with the circumstances which he found existing there, and desired to visit the city in person as early as 952. He sent the Bishops of Mainz and Chur to Rome, where they were to take counsel with the Pope concerning his reception, and probably concerning many more important questions. These envoys were sent to the Pope, not to the Tyrant of Rome; but the decided refusal to admit them came from Alberic and does no little honour to his energy. The great king was repulsed by the Senator of all the Romans; with his wife Adelaide he submissively returned to his dominions.[1]

Alberic prevents Otto's visit to Rome.

Berengar, so suddenly frustrated in all his hopes, surrendered to Conrad, Duke of Lorraine, Otto's lieutenant in Italy. He appeared with his son at the Diet in Augsburg, and here as a German vassal received the Lombard crown, while the Marches of Verona and Aquileja, removed from the union of Italian states, were made over by royal desire to Otto's

Berengar becomes Otto's vassal.

[1] *Otho Rex Legationem pro susceptione sua Romam dirigit. Qua non obtenta, cum uxore in sua regreditur.*—Flodoard, *Chron. A.* 952.

brother, Duke Henry of Bavaria.[1] Berengar returned humiliated to his kingdom. Henceforward the sword of Otto hung suspended over his head, although, thanks to internal broils in Germany, some years of independence were still allowed him. He appears to have made his abode chiefly in Ravenna. This celebrated city, already long overshadowed by Pavia and Milan, and now almost forgotten, again attained importance and attracted the attention of the Emperor. Neither the arm of the Pope, to whom according to treaty it belonged, nor that of Alberic, reached to the distant provinces of the ancient Exarchate, which the Church had gradually acquired from the Kings of Italy.

So stood things in northern Italy when the illustrious Prince and Senator of all the Romans quitted the stage of history. Alberic died in Rome in the flower of his manhood in 954. The day and month of his death are unknown.[2] Fate happily spared him the trial of seeing his country fall under a new Imperial yoke. As he felt his end approach, he hastened to S. Peter's (as the chronicler of Soracte informs us), and obliged the Roman nobles to swear before the shrine of the Apostle, that upon the death of Agapitus II., they would elect his son and heir Octavian to the papal throne. We do not doubt the statement: Alberic's clear intellect must have recognised that in Rome the separation of the temporal

Death of Alberic, 954.

[1] *Contin. Regin. ad A.* 952.

[2] *Albericus princeps Romae obiit. Annal. Farf. A.* 954. *Flod. Chron.: Alberico Patricio Romanor. defuncto, filius ejus Octavianus, cum esset Clericus, Principatum adeptus est.*

power from the Papacy was impossible for any length of time. In the hope of the intervention of Germany, however, the Papacy had acquired a new power under Agapitus, and sooner or later Otto I. must seize the reins of government in Rome. Alberic understood this. The work which his genius had been able to accomplish could not be continued by the mediocre intellect of his youthful son. He therefore secured dominion to Octavian in inducing the Romans to invest him with the Papal crown, and thus hoped at least to bequeath to his family the supreme power in Rome.

When we reflect that the rule of Alberic had lasted twenty-two years, and throughout the changes of four pontificates,—when we consider that he victoriously resisted the temporal claims of the Church and the revolts of a nobility and people accustomed to a state of anarchy,—when we remember that he also withstood the attempts of powerful enemies outside, and that on his death he was able to transmit his power to his boyish son,—we are forced to allow the "Senator" the foremost place among the Roman citizens of the Middle Ages. Alberic is an honour to the Italy of his age, and was indeed worthy of the name of Roman. The title of Great, which his descendants, in the pride of their ancestry, seem to have bestowed upon him, might well have been accorded him by his contemporaries.[1] His race

[1] The epitaph of a child, a grandson of Alberic, belonging to the year 1030, says:

Aurea progenies jacet hic vocitata Johs
Fletu digna gravi flore tenella ruai

did not die either with him or his son Octavian, but survived in various branches, and in the eleventh century ruled Rome for the second time in the Counts of Tusculum.

Gregorio patri fuit et dilectio matri
Atque nepos magni principis Alberici.

Coppi, *Memor. Colonnesi*, p. 18; now built into the wall of the monastery of S. Paul.

CHAPTER III.

1. Octavian succeeds Alberic in the Government —He becomes Pope as John XII., 955 — His Excesses—He forsakes his Father's Policy—The Lombards and John XII. invite Otto I. to Rome—Otto's Treaty with the Pope—His Oath —The Imperial Coronation, February 2, 962— Character of the new Roman Imperium of the German Nation.

Octavian Princeps of the Romans 954.

On his father's death, the youthful Octavian, son of Alberic by Alda, was recognised without opposition as Princeps and Senator of all the Romans.[1] The young ruler continued the temporal government of his father according to the accustomed forms. No Roman coins of this period have come down to us, but undoubtedly Octavian must have had coins engraved with his name and his title of Princeps. He was little more than sixteen years old when he was called to government. In his pride and ambition Alberic had bestowed the name of Octavian on the boy, thus perhaps giving expression to the audacious hope that his race might

[1] The barbarous Benedict of Soracte says: *genuit autem ex his principem ex concubinam filium, imposuit eis nomen Octavianus* (c. 34); and he had previously spoken of *regibus Langobardorum*, by which he could only have meant Hugo. Even Alda must be a concubine, these chroniclers treating women simply as courtesans.

rise to Imperial greatness. In this hope he was deceived. Even during the pontificate of Agapitus, the papal claims had found an increased number of adherents, and the German power in the distance had assumed threatening proportions. Alberic himself destined the papal crown for his son; he intended that under this son the temporal power should be reunited to the Papacy, and he thus drew Roman history back into its ancient path.

Octavian as Pope John XII., 955–963.

Agapitus, dying in the autumn of 955, the young Princeps of the Romans actually became Pope in the course of a year.[1] We are not informed by any historian except the chronicler of Soracte that he had the advantage of a clerical education, nor do we know whether, previous to his elevation to the Sacred Chair, he had been invested with any ecclesiastical dignity. He exchanged his princely name of Octavian for that of John XII.; and we are told that from this time onwards it became the rule for Popes to change their family name. The heir of Alberic now united the secular and spiritual powers, and the only result of the revolution of 932 was the elevation of the ruling patrician family to the chair of Peter, which this family hoped to make an hereditary possession. John's princely instincts were stronger than his taste for spiritual duties, and the two natures—that of Octavian and that of John XII.—stood in unequal

[1] Benedict, c. 35: *Agapitus p. decessit. Octavianus in sede—susceptus est.* The *Chron. Farf.*, p. 472, wrongly says: *qui patre vivente P. ordinatus est.* Pagi makes him Pope on May 12, 956; a statement which Mansi (note to Baron. *A.* 955) has already corrected from John's letters in Ughelli, viii. 57. The month remains doubtful.

His undisciplined life.

conflict. Called as he was in the immaturity of youth to a position which gave him claims on the reverence of the world, his judgment deserted him, and he plunged into the most unbridled sensuality. The Lateran palace was turned into an abode of riot and debauchery. The gilded youths of the city were his daily companions. Caligula had once made his horse a senator. Pope John, probably in a fit of intoxication, consequent on some revel where he had drunk deep in honour of the ancient gods, bestowed consecration on a deacon in a stable.[1]

The conditions of Rome during the early years of his reign are imperfectly known to us. The heedless youth forsook his father's moderate line of conduct; and being Prince and Pope at the same time, he desired to accomplish some great undertaking, and to extend his dominion far into the south. With the united Romans, Tuscans and Spoletans he undertook an expedition against Pandulf and Landulf II. of Benevento and Capua; but the movement of Gisulf of Salerno in favour of the enemy induced him to return, and he entered into a treaty with this prince at Terracina.[2] Papal greatness spurred him on. From his father he had inherited a certain courage, but not wisdom. As Pope he wished, in fact he determined, to restore the ecclesiastical state to its

[1] *Vitae Papar.* in *Mur.* iii. 2, 327. Liutprand and the Annals of Rheims. Even the simple Benedict says he was worse than a pagan: *habebat consuetudinem sepius venandi, non quasi apostolicus, sed quasi homo ferus—diligebat collectio feminarum* (a splendid expression) *odibilis ecclesiarum, amabilis juvenis ferocitatis.*

[2] The *Anon. Salern.*, c. 166, gives the only information of this event.

former boundaries, and for the sake of recovering the Exarchate he thoughtlessly appeared at the head of the German party against Berengar. Meanwhile, as the Romans were no longer restrained by the strong hand of Alberic, his rule was in danger in the city itself. The policy of the father, based upon moderation, could not be continued by the son as Pope. The work of Alberic therefore fell to pieces, and John XII. at length found himself obliged to call King Otto to his aid for the sake of his temporal dominions. As Octavian he might possibly have been powerful in Rome; as John XII. he was weak and unpopular. We thus see how strangely the blending of the two natures, the royal and the priestly, influenced the position of the Popes.

Berengar becomes powerful.

While Otto remained in Germany, occupied with the rebellion of his children and of the Hungarians, Berengar and Adalbert profited by his absence to subjugate the recalcitrant counts and bishops of Lombardy. Their enemies of the German faction, especially the malicious Liutprand (offended, we know not how, by Berengar), have represented these princes in the darkest colours. Willa, the wife of Berengar was odious, partly on account of her avarice, but neither her husband nor Adalbert had done more to secure their sovereignty than their predecessors had done, or more than German kings permitted themselves to do in later times. After the sudden death of Liudolf, who had been sent by his father Otto to Italy to keep Berengar in check, Berengar seemed to become invincible. He threatened the Emilia and Romagna, and John XII. was too weak to defend

John XII. invites Otto to Rome.

these patrimonies. The son of the same Alberic, who had once driven Otto back from the very gates of Rome, in 960 invited the German King to visit the city. The papal envoys were accompanied by messengers from several Italian counts and bishops, amongst whom was Walbert, Archbishop of Milan, who came to Otto in person. Otbert, ancestor of the Este family, did likewise.[1]

The German King accepted the invitation of Italy, which offered him the coveted Imperial crown, and resumed the work of the energetic Arnulf. First securing the German succession to his youthful son in Worms, he crossed the Alps above Trent with a formidable army.[2] While the two kings, abandoned by the Lombards, kept within their fortresses, Otto celebrated the Christmas festival of 961 in Pavia; then, sending Hatto of Fulda to announce his coming, he set forth for Rome.[3] On January 31 he reached the city and pitched his camp on the Field of Nero. He had come in virtue of a treaty with the Pope; and while he undertook the duties of guardianship and the restoration of the Church, the rights of the Carolingian Empire with some restrictions were offered him. "If, with God's will, I come to Rome," so ran his oath, "I will exalt the Church and Thee, its overseer, according to my powers. Never shalt

Treaty with Otto.

[1] E. Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosze*, p. 318.

[2] Benedict of Soracte (c. 36) describes the aspect of his followers, who appeared to the writer like Huns: *Erat enim aspectus eorum orribilis, ei curbis properantes, carpentes iter, et ad prelium ut ferro stantes.*

[3] *Rex Hattonem, Fuldensem abbatem, ad construenda sibi habitacula Romam praemisit. Cont. Regin. A.* 961.

Thou be injured in life or limb or in Thy dignity with my sanction and knowledge. I will never hold a Placitum, or make any regulation concerning aught within Thy jurisdiction or that of the Romans within Thy city of Rome. Whatever of S. Peter's property comes into my hands I will restore to Thee. To whomsoever I shall bequeath the kingdom of Italy, he shall swear that according to his power he will be Thy helper in defence of the ecclesiastical state."[1]

Otto accordingly set to work with great circumspection. We must not forget that he had to deal with the Romans of Alberic, so long ruled by national institutions. Although he now tendered this oath by which he, the Emperor, renounced the privilege of holding unrestricted initiative placita, still the treaty is not equivalent to an Imperial constitution of the Empire, which was yet to be determined.

On February 2, Otto made his solemn entry into the Leonina amid Imperial honours. Alberic's refractory nobility alone held aloof in gloomy silence; on the faces of the Romans, whom he had come to deprive of freedom and power, he read feelings of mortal hatred. Before preparing for his coronation procession

[1] The three recensions of this oath: *Mon. Germ.*, iv. 29. It is not found in Liutprand or in the *Cont. Regin.*; first in Bonizo ad Amicum (*Oefele, Rer. Boicar.*, ii. 800), in Deusdedit, *Cod. Vat.* 3833, from which it passed into the book of Cencius. I also read it in the *Cod. Vat.* 1437, fol. 135, in the *Vita Joh. XII.*, with which the so-called Vitae of Nicolaus Aragoniae begin. The authenticity of this form of oath has frequently been doubted. Dönniges (*Jahrb. d. D. Reichs*, i. 3, *Ab.* 201) rejects it, more especially on account of the passage concerning the placita. The form of the oath is not beyond suspicion; the substance, however, is unquestioned. The best text of the oath is in Jaffé (*Bibl.*, ii. 588), who does not doubt its tenor.

he warned his sword-bearer, Ansfried von Löwen, as follows:—"When I kneel to-day at the grave of the Apostle, hold thy sword ever above my head, for well I know that my predecessors have often experienced the faithlessness of the Romans. The wise avert evil by prudence; on our return to Mons Gaudii thou may'st pray for what favours thou wilt."[1] Otto and Adelaide were crowned at S. Peter's with unexampled pomp. After an interval of thirty-seven years the Empire was again revived, and, withdrawn from the Italian nation, was restored in the foreign race of the Saxon Kings. One of Charles's greatest successors was crowned by a Roman, who curiously enough bore the name Octavianus. But the momentous transaction was devoid of all true dignity and consecration. Charles the Great had received the Imperial crown at the hands of an honoured and venerable man. Otto the Great was anointed by an undisciplined boy. Meanwhile the history of Germany and Italy was by means of this coronation diverted into a new path.

Imperial Coronation of Otto I., Feb. 2, 962.

The Empire of Charles when called into existence had possessed a lofty justification in the imagination of mankind. The great Frankish monarchy, in which nationalities still stood weak beside each other, had been conceived under the form of the new Christian republic. The emancipation of the city from the dominion of Byzantium, the necessity of opposing a strong Christian power to the formidable dominion of Islam, and the needs of the Papacy, had contributed to the foundation of the Carolingian power. But this

Differences between the Imperium of Charles and that of Otto.

[1] Thietmar, *Chron.*, iv. 22: *deinde redeundo ad montem Gaudii quantum volueris, orato.*

theocratic Empire fell by the pressure of its inward development. The ferment in society, where old and new, Roman and Teutonic elements mixed together, divided the second Empire. The feudal system transformed officials into local hereditary princes; secular and religious powers were united. A permanent revolution in possession and right was generated in the body corporate of the monarchy, and the subdivision of estates amongst the heirs hastened its decay. Nationalities suddenly began to separate from one another; the centre of Europe fell into two hostile divisions, and after an hundred and fifty years of existence, the Empire was dissolved and reduced to a state similar to that which had existed before its rise: pressure of new barbarians, of Normans, Hungarians, Slavs and Saracens; devastations of provinces, decay of learning and art, barbarism of manners, relapse of the Church into the state in which she had been sunk before the time of Charles; enervation of the Papacy, which had lost both its spiritual power and the state created for it by Pipin and Charles, in Rome a chaos of aristocratic factions more dangerous than that which had existed in the time of Leo III.—such were the conditions that prevailed. The Italians, it is true, had attempted to make the Roman Imperium a national institution. Their attempt had, however, failed, and the Papacy itself again sought its salvation in the restoration of the Imperium through a foreign princely house which stood far from Italy and Rome.

The Roman Empire was now restored by the

German nation, but mankind could no longer return to the ideas which had prevailed in the time of Charles. The tradition of the Empire did indeed still powerfully survive. Many voices were heard in Germany lamenting its fall and desiring its restoration as a benefit to the world. The reverence of mankind for the institution, however, had been diminished by its unfortunate history of a century and a half. The unity and cohesion of Charles's monarchy endured no longer. France, Germany and Italy were already separate countries, each striving after independence in its political forms. While Otto I. now restored the Empire, it became clear that the task was one which none but a great man could accomplish; that a weakling could not sustain the struggle against the feudal system, the Papacy, and national tendencies. The Empire was therefore restored only in an ideal and artificial, though also in a great political form. The conqueror of the Hungarians, the Slavs and the Danes, the protector of France and Burgundy, the lord of Italy, the heroic missionary of Christianity, to which he had opened a new and wider field, deserved to be a new Charles. His country was always called the land of the Franks, and his German tongue the Frankish. He now brought the Roman Imperial power to the German nation, and this energetic people took to itself the honourable but thankless task of becoming the Atlas of universal history. The influence of Germany soon brought about the reform of the Church and the restoration of learning, while in Italy itself it was the German elements that fostered the city republics.

Germany and Italy indeed, the purest representatives of the antique and the German character, the fairest provinces in the kingdom of the human intellect, have been brought by a historic necessity into this lasting connection. When we consider that it is essentially to the connection of Germany with Italy that mankind owes the foundations of universal European culture, we ought hardly to regret that the Roman Empire was imposed like a destiny upon Germany, causing her for centuries to shed her blood on the other side of the Alps.

2. Charter of Otto—John and the Romans do Homage to the Emperor—John conspires against him—Receives Adalbert in Rome—Otto enters the City and the Pope escapes—The Emperor deprives the Romans of the right of Papal Election—The November Synod—Deposition of John XII.—Leo VIII.—Unsuccessful Revolt of the Romans—Otto leaves Rome.

The Charter of Otto I.

On February 13 the Emperor Otto gave John a document, which confirmed to the Pope and his successors all the rights and privileges that the Carolingians had in earlier times bestowed upon the Sacred Chair. The restoration of the Empire, its transference to the royal house of Saxony, and finally the confusion which reigned in Italian affairs and in the ecclesiastical state made the Charter absolutely necessary. The original deed is not extant, but a copy, which latest research has pronounced contemporary, has been preserved among the Vatican

archives. If doubts as to the authenticity of this document cannot be entirely refuted, and both form and contents occasionally appear suspicious, it cannot at all events be denied that Otto ratified the Carolingian Donation in its full extent, while at the same time he held fast to the Imperial rights, as they had been established, particularly by the Constitution of Lothar in reference to the recognition of the Papal election and the Roman administration of justice by Imperial missi.[1]

The Pope himself took the oath of fidelity to the Emperor and promised never to desert him for Berengar. The Romans on their side tendered the oath of obedience, and the constitutional relations of Carolingian times between Otto, the Pope and the city appeared to be renewed.[2] But John's position remained involved in contradictions. From his father he had inherited the princely power in Rome; with

[1] *Privileg. Ottonis*, *Mon. Germ.*, *Leg. II.*, App. 164. Muratori, Berretta, Goldast, deny its authenticity. The literature of the subject is given by Waitz, *Jahrb. d. D. R.* i. 3, 207. The Church is confirmed in possession of Venice, Istria, Spoleto, Benevento, even Naples, *necnon patrimonium Sicilie, si Deus illud nostris tradiderit manibus.* The articles concerning the Missi, the election and consecration of the Pope in their presence, are in order, and show that Otto determined to adhere to the earlier constitution of the Empire. With regard to this document, see Ficker, *Forsch. Otto's I. zur Rechtsgesch. Ital.* ii. 335 ff., and Th. Sickel, *Das Privilegium Otto's I. für die röm Kirche. vom J.* 962, 1883. Sickel holds the Vat. document, which was known to Baronius and Cenni, for a draft, made with the Emperor's knowledge of his agreement, which renewed with some variations the *Ludovicianum.*

[2] The *Vita Mathildis Reginae* (*M. Germ.*, vi. c. 21) even says: *totus pop. Rom. se sponte subjugavit ipsius dominatui, et sibi solvebant tributa, et post illum ceteris suis posteris.* This, however, is a fable.

this power he had united the Papacy. The revolution had been followed by the restoration, and the restoration had culminated in the Imperium. The Roman aristocracy found themselves again brought under the power of the Emperor and the Pope. The independence, which they had so long enjoyed under Alberic, had ceased, and the old opposition between the Pope and the Romans must therefore be renewed even more fiercely than before.

Outside the Empire the belief had arisen that Otto had restored freedom to Rome, had given back her privileges to the oppressed Church, and had freed the city from the tyranny of licentious women and insolent nobles.[1] Meanwhile the new Emperor regarded with indignation the dissolute life of the youthful Pope. He was already able to foresee what he had to expect from the son of Alberic. Otto left Rome on February 14, 962, for northern Italy, where Berengar remained entrenched in the fortress of S. Leo, near Montefeltro. It was necessary for him to subjugate this last representative of Italian nationality before he could feel himself in truth Emperor.[2]

Scarcely had Otto left the city when John began to

John XII. commits perjury.

[1] *Adami Gesta Hammab. Eccl., M. Germ.* ix. 308; ii. c. 9: *Romamque pristinae reddidit libertati.* We should read what Liutprand (*Legatio*, c. 5) replied to the reproaches of Byzantium.

[2] According to the *Cod. Vat.*, 1340, Otto came to Rome *m. Jan. die xxxi. feria vi., et stetit ibi dieb. xv., et exiit inde m. Febr. die xiiii. in festo S. Valentini, Ind. V.* On Feb. 21 he was at Rignano, and was therefore still in the neighbourhood of Rome; he here issued a charter for Monte Amiata: *Actum Rignano IX. Kal. Mar. Ind. V., A.* 962. *Cod. Dipl. Amiat.* of Fatteschi, ccxiii. p. 193.—Stumpf, *Die Reichskanzler*, 28.

find the Imperial power an oppressive burthen. The consequences of Otto's Roman expedition had far surpassed his calculations. From a liberator of the State of the Church he had become a ruler—one who would be Emperor in the highest sense—a monarch such as would never be satisfied to play the submissive part of Charles the Bald. John now wished the past undone. Compelled by the nobles, he conspired with Berengar and Adalbert. The Imperial party in Rome watched all his movements, and reported them to Otto on his arrival in Pavia in the spring of 963. The Imperial agents described the licentious life of the Pope, who had turned the Lateran into a brothel, and had squandered towns and estates upon his mistresses. They told the Emperor that no respectable woman dared any longer to make a pilgrimage to Rome, from fear of falling into the power of the Pope. They lamented the desertion of the city and the ruin of the churches, through the decaying roofs of which the rain streamed upon the altars below. The answer with which Otto attempted to excuse John's conduct constitutes the bitterest satire on the condition of the Papacy. "The Pope," he said, "is still a boy, and will learn to control himself by the example of nobler men."[1] He sent messengers to Rome to make further enquiries into the existing state of things, and started for S. Leo to besiege Berengar and Willa. As he lay before the fortress in the summer of 963, he received the nuncios of the Pope, Demetrius, son of Meliosus and the Protos-

[1] *Puer, inquit, est, facile bonorum immutabitur exemplo virorum.* Liutprand, *Hist. Ottonis*, c. 5.

criniar Leo, who came to complain that he occupied the ecclesiastical estates and sought to subdue S. Leo, the property of S. Peter. Otto, who had delayed the restitution of several patrimonies, answered that he could not restore the property of the Church before he had taken it from the usurpers. Holding in his hands the proofs of John's intrigues, he could show to the nuncios intercepted letters from the Pope to the Greek Emperor, and even to the Hungarians, whom John had summoned to invade Germany. The Imperial envoys went forthwith to Rome to explain to the Pope that their master was prepared to wipe out the suspicion of disloyalty by oath or by the judgment of God in a duel. They were, however, ungraciously received, and scarcely had they left, in the company of papal messengers, when Adalbert appeared in the city. The young pretender played towards Otto the same miserable part to which Adelchis had formerly been condemned. While his father defended S. Leo, he wandered indefatigably hither and thither to collect followers. He demanded help from Byzantium, he hastened to the Saracens at Fraxinetum, he went, as Sextus Pompeius once had done, to Corsica, and here entered into negotiations with the Pope; lastly, he landed at Civita Vecchia, and the gates of Rome were opened to him.

He summons Adalbert to Rome.

On receiving the news, Otto hastened from S. Leo to Rome in the autumn of 963. The population of the city was split into an Imperial and a Papal faction, and it remained thus divided for centuries. The Imperialists, who had summoned Otto on the arrival of Adalbert, held themselves intrenched in

Otto I. returns to Rome, 963.

Johannipolis, while the Papal or national party, led by Adalbert and the Pope himself (John appeared as a knight in armour and helmet), held the Leonine city. The Pope resolved to defend Rome; he drove Otto back to the Tiber. His heart, however, soon failed him, and his opponents waxed stronger every day. The populace which had made a resolute resistance to Hugo's attacks trembled in dread of an assault. The son of Alberic feared treason; he collected the church's treasures, and with Adalbert escaped to the Campagna and apparently shut himself up in Tivoli.[1] His adherents laid down their arms and gave hostages, and the Emperor entered Rome for the second time on November 2, 963.

John XII. escapes.

Otto I. deprives the Romans of the right of Papal Election.

He assembled clergy, nobles, and the heads of the people, and forced them to swear that they would not ordain or even elect any Pope without his or his son's consent. He thus deprived the Romans of the right which they had hitherto preserved as their jewel and their one single act of civic independence—a right with which even the Carolingians had not ventured to interfere. This right, that of electing the head of the Church, properly belonged to the whole Christian community, and not to the insignificant body of Roman electors. But since it was impossible that the whole of Christendom could exercise a vote, the election had long since silently passed into the hands of the

[1] *Campaniam fugiens, ibi in silvis et montibus more bestiae latuit. Vita Joh. XII.*, *Cod. Vat.* 1437, *Chron. Farf.*, p. 476, and the Treves manuscript of the Privilegium of Leo VIII. (in Flosz), *Cont. Regin.*, and Liutprand, *Hist. Otton.*, where Tiberis (Tivoli) is mentioned as the abode of the Pope.

Romans, or rather each Bishop of Rome had been recognised in succession as head of the universal Church. This invaluable privilege lay in the hands of the Clergy, Ordo and Populus of the Romans, and the right of ratification exercised by earlier Emperors as heads of the universal Empire was the only limit that had been placed upon it.

He summons a Synod in S. Peter's.

Otto summoned a Synod in S. Peter's on November 6. As in the time of the Patricius Charles, sentence was to be pronounced on an accused Pope under the presidency of the temporal authority. But John XII. unlike Leo III. had neither given his consent to the trial, nor was he present, nor did the bishops now declare themselves unauthorised to sit in judgment on the Apostolic Chair. The times had changed. An Emperor appeared in all the majesty of power as administrator of the degenerate ecclesiastical government. He ruthlessly laid bare before the eyes of the world the shame of the Pope by whom he had been consecrated. He called upon the people to accuse the Pope, and his commands were obeyed by a Synod, which for the first time judged and deposed a Pope without having accorded him a hearing, and then elected an Imperial candidate as his successor.

Composition of this Synod.

Liutprand, at this time Bishop of Cremona and an eye-witness of the events, has described the Acts of this Synod. He enumerates all the bishops of the Roman territory here present, and we find that, in spite of the Saracens, many very ancient bishoprics still existed. Of the Suburbican bishops, there appeared those of Albano, Ostia and Portus, of

Praeneste, Silva Candida and the Sabina; further, the Bishops of Gabium, Velletri, Forum Claudii (Oriolum), Bleda and Nepi, of Caere, Tibur, Alatri, and Anagni, of Trevi, Ferentino, Norma and Veruli, of Sutri, Narni, Gallese and Falerii, of Orta and Terracina.[1] Liutprand mentions only thirteen cardinals of the following titulars: Balbina, Anastasia, Lorenzo in Damaso, Chrysogonus, Equitius, Susanna, Pammachius, Calixtus, Cecilia, Lorenzo in Lucina, Sixtus, IV Coronati and Santa Sabina. Several cardinals had followed the fugitive Pope. Many titulars may have become extinct. The historian names as present all the ministers of the Papal Palace, the deacons and regionaries, the notaries, even the Primicerius of the School of Singers. The mention of some Roman nobles, amongst whom we discover many already well-known names, excites, however, an even greater interest. Stephen, son of the Superista John; Demetrius, son of Meliosus, Crescentius of the Marble Horse (here mentioned for the first time), John Mizina (better de Mizina), Stephen de Imiza, Theodore de Rufina, John de Primicerio, Leo de Cazunuli, Richard, Peter de Cannapara, Benedict and his son Bulgamin, were now the principal Romans belonging to the Imperial party. Several of the nobles had accompanied the Pope in his flight; others remained in their fortresses on the Campagna. The Roman plebs were represented by

[1] There is here as little mention of the Bishop of Tusculum as in the Synod of John XII. of 964. The survival of Forum Claudii and Falerii with their ancient names is remarkable. Tres Tabernae had disappeared. Centumcellae is not mentioned, nor yet Polimartium, but both endured. Liutprand, *Hist. Otton.*, c. 9. For this Synod see Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iv. 582.

the captains of the militia, headed by Peter, bearing the surname Imperiola.[1] His presence, of which special mention is made, shows the independent development in Rome of the plebeian element, which dated from Alberic. Had Alberic given the Romans a constitution, had he appointed senate and tribunes for the people, had he nominated two consuls annually, civic dignities such as these could not have escaped the notice of an observer such as Liutprand. The bishop, however, never by a single syllable mentions either senate, senators or other magistrates. He merely speaks of the primates of the city, of the militia and of their captain, as representatives of the "plebs," and quotes the other officers of the Palace already known to us.

The complete representation of all the elective classes caused the synod to resemble the synod of Leo III. Like its predecessor, this synod was at the same time council, diet and court of justice. The presidency of a powerful emperor, the presence of so many bishops, dukes and counts of Germany

[1] *E plebe Petrus, qui et Imperiola est dictus adstitit cum omni Romanorum milizia.* In documents this Roman is frequently called *Petrus de Imperio. Cod. Sessor.* ccxvii. p. 131, *A.* 966: *Libellum Petri de Imperio vocati.* In 1006 *Crescentius de Imperio*, probably his son, *ibid.* p. 247. The name Impéroli still exists.—Some of these nobles are found again in documents. See the document of July 28, 966, in Giesebrecht I., Appendix D. Demetrius, son of the Consul and Dux Meliosus, possessed a fortress near Velletri from the year 946 (Borgia, *Stor. di Velletri*, p. 158); perhaps the same, who appears in 979 as uncle of Marozza (Murat., Ant. V. 773). Stephen's mother Imiza was at that time the most cultured woman in Rome, the friend of John XIII. and of Theophania; she corresponded with Gerbert. Gerberti, Ep. 22: *Dominae Imizae.*

as well as of Italy, lent it a character of the highest importance. The attendance of Romans of all classes preserved it from the accusation of unlawful force. The trial was, however, an act of Imperial dictatorship. John of Narni and John the cardinal-deacon appeared as the chief accusers of the absent Pope. The deed of accusation was read by Cardinal Benedict. Otto did not speak Latin; the Emperor of the Romans therefore commanded his secretary Liutprand to answer the Romans in his stead.

Accusations against the Pope.

The writ of citation repeated the accusations brought against the Holy Father. "To the supreme Pontifex and Universal Pope, to the Lord John, Otto by the Grace of God Imperator Augustus, together with the Archbishops and Bishops of Liguria, Tuscany, Saxony and of France, greetings in the Lord.—Having come to Rome in the service of the Lord, we have questioned the Roman bishops, cardinals and deacons, moreover the people in general, as to the cause of your absence and the reasons why you will not meet us, the Defender of yourself and your Church. Charges so disgraceful are laid to your account, that were they reported of even a comedian would make us blush for shame. Since a day would not suffice to enumerate all the accusations levied against you, we shall only bring one instance before the notice of your Excellency. Learn, therefore, that you have been accused, not by a few persons only but by the world at large, by laity as well as clergy, of murder and perjury, of sacrilege, of incest with members of your own family,—with your two sisters.[1] Your accusers

[1] *Viduam Rainerii et Stephaniam patris concubinam et Annam*

further assert that which we are unwilling to believe, that you drank a toast to the Devil, and playing at dice invoked Zeus, Venus and other demons. We therefore implore your Fatherhood to come to Rome to purge yourself from these accusations. Do you fear the excesses of the people? We promise that nothing shall be done contrary to the Canon.—Given on the 6th November."

From his retreat the accused returned a brief answer in his character of Pope. "John Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, to all the bishops.—We have heard that you wish to appoint another Pope. If you do so, I will excommunicate you by the Almighty God, and you shall neither ordain anyone nor celebrate mass." The bishops ridiculed the style of the Papal brief, from which it was evident that John was only accustomed to express himself in the vulgar tongue.[1] According to the Canon, an accused bishop must be summoned three times; the Emperor satisfied himself with two citations. He was at the same time accuser and judge; and after the Synod had moved the deposition, John XII., without any defence, was pronounced a criminal and guilty of high treason, and was declared deposed. The objection may be urged that the Synod had not acted altogether canonically. The world, however, is more tolerant of an offence com-

John XII. is deposed.

viduam cum nepte sua abusum esse, et S. palatium Lateranense lupanar et prostibulum fecisse. Liutprand, c. 10.

[1] *Johannes Ep. Servus Servor. Dei, omnibus Epsps. Nos audivimus dicere, quia vos vultis alium papam facere; si hoc facitis excommunio vos da Deum omnipotentem, ut non habeatis licentiam nullum ordinare, et missam celebrare.* Liutprand, c. 13; and the *mockery of the bishops*, c. 14.

mitted against the forms of canon law than of an outrage against the dignity of mankind.

A distinguished Roman was put forward by the Emperor as candidate for the vacant chair; he was elected on December 4 and consecrated on the 6th.

Leo VIII. raised to the Papacy.

Leo VIII., contrary to ecclesiastical law, rose from the condition of layman to S. Peter's Chair, the Cardinal-bishop Sico of Ostia having in the most summary manner consecrated him successively Ostiarius, Lector, Acolyte, Sub-deacon, Deacon, Presbyter and Pope.[1] His position was that of Proto-scriniar of the Church, and his name appears in documents of the period.[2] He dwelt on the Clivus Argentarii, the present Salita di Marforio, a street which was henceforth called "ascent of Leo Protus" (Protoscrinarius). As late as the thirteenth century, a church on the spot was known as "S. Lorenzo *de ascensa Proti*."[3] Leo's blameless life had recommended him to the Emperor. None but a man in every way worthy of respect dared Otto put forward as successor to a profligate.

In order to relieve the Romans from the burthen of maintaining his army, the Emperor ordered a portion of the troops to S. Leo. He himself celebrated

[1] John XII. justly resisted this abuse; Actio 2 of his Council of February 26 (Baron., *A.* 964).

[2] Marini, n. 101, *A.* 961, where Leo Protoscrinarius is mentioned as owner of a casale on the Via Appia.

[3] A diploma of Anaclete II. (Casimiro, *Istor. Araceli*, p. 434) calls the Clivus: *descensus Leonis Prothi. Galletti* (*Del Primic*, p. 143) gives an inscription with the name *de Ascensa Proti*. The oldest continuation of Anastasius (*Cod. Vat.*, 1437) says: *Leo nat. rom. protoscrinio ex patre Johe. protoscrinio de regione clivus arg. sed. a.* I, *m.* iv.; and following it, *Cod. Vat.* 1437.

the Christmas festival in Rome, unconscious that a conspiracy had been formed against him. The deposition of John XII. had made him an object of sympathy. He was, moreover, the son of the great Alberic, and had been voluntarily elected Pope by the Roman people. On January 3, 964, the alarm bells were suddenly rung, and the Romans rushed to the Vatican where Otto dwelt; their attempts were, however, unsuccessful. The Imperialists repulsed their assailants, broke down the barricades at S. Angelo and slew the fugitives, until Otto himself put an end to the slaughter.[1] This was the first revolt of the Roman people against a German Emperor. The following day the Romans appeared before Otto to sue for mercy. They swore obedience both to him and to Pope Leo on the grave of the Apostle. Otto knew the value of the oath; he took a hundred hostages and allowed the humiliated citizens to depart. He remained an entire week in Rome. At Leo's entreaty he released the hostages, and, hoping to acquire friends for the Pope of his creation by leaving him in a defenceless position, he set forth to meet Adalbert at Spoleto about the middle of January 964. He quitted the city in anger, leaving the Pope like a lamb among wolves. The blood which had been shed on January 3 never dried in Rome. Hatred to the foreigner found nourishment therefrom, and the Romans who had been repressed by force, scarcely saw their prisoners at liberty and the Emperor at a distance, when they hastened to give vent to their desire for revenge.

Revolt of the Romans.

[1] *Cont. Regin.*, *A.* 964; Liutprand, c. 16.

3. Return of John XII.—Flight of Leo VIII.—He is deposed by a Council—John's revenge upon his Enemies—His Death, May 964—The Romans elect Benedict V.—Otto conducts Leo VIII. back to Rome—Deposition and Exile of Benedict—The Papacy rendered subject to the German Emperor—Privilegium of Leo VIII.

John XII. returns to Rome.

John XII., hastily summoned back to the city, arrived with an army of friends and vassals, and Leo VIII. found himself deserted. He escaped with a few followers to the Emperor at Camerino. Berengar and Willa, who had surrendered at S. Leo, had been sent by Otto to Bamberg, and Adalbert's latest attempt could scarcely appear formidable to the Emperor. Nevertheless Otto did not immediately advance on Rome, probably owing to the fact, that as he had dismissed a great part of his troops, it was first necessary to collect new reinforcements. John meanwhile exercised a cruel revenge upon his enemies.

He summons a Council.

On February 26 he assembled a council in S. Peter's. Among the sixteen bishops present were eleven who had signed his deposition. These prelates might justly or otherwise represent their participation in Otto's Council as having been compulsory, and the cardinals might urge a like defence. Not only the insignificant number of clergy present at John's Synod, but also their adhesion to the two Synods, show the hopeless state of confusion in which the Roman Church was sunk. John explained that owing to the Emperor's violence he had been driven into a two months' exile, and that he had now re-

turned to his throne. He condemned the Synod which had deposed him. The bishops of Albano and Portus acknowledged themselves guilty in having uncanonically consecrated Leo. They were suspended, and Sico of Ostia, who had conferred the various degrees of consecration, was deprived of his orders.[1]

John excommunicated Leo, and then vented his anger on many of his more distinguished opponents. He deprived Cardinal John of nose, tongue and two fingers; the Protoscriniar Azzo of a hand. Both men had been his legates at the time that he had invited Otto to Rome.[2] He ordered Otger, Bishop of Spiers, to be scourged, but repressed his thirst for revenge so far as to send the bishop to the Emperor, whom he did not wish to irritate to too great a degree. Otto meanwhile remained at Camerino, where he had celebrated Easter with his own Pope. He prepared to march against Rome, but before he reached the city he received the news of John's death. If certain reports be true, the death of the Pope was worthy of his life. To gratify an adulterous passion he had gone one night outside the city, when he was summoned by the Devil, represented by an outraged husband. The man struck him a blow on the head, and John died in the course of eight days (May 14, 964). Other writers speak of a stroke of apoplexy, which in his state of mental excitement seems a probable occurrence. The son of the glorious Alberic thus fell a sacrifice to his own unbridled passion, and to the

Death of John XII., 964.

[1] Mansi, *Conc. XVIII.*, 472.

[2] *Acta Consil. Remens.*, c. 28 (*M. Germ.*, *T. V.*).

anomalous position which he held as Prince and Pope at the same time. His youth, the greatness of his father, the tragic discords of his position, claim for him a lenient judgment.[1]

The Romans raise Benedict V. to the Papacy.

On the death of John the Romans broke the oath which had been extorted from them, and on February 26, deposing Leo VIII., whom they no longer recognised as Pope, they again sought to defy the Emperor. Benedict the cardinal-deacon was elected after a violent dispute between the factions, and was acclaimed by the militia. Benedict was a worthy man, and one who in the midst of the prevailing barbarism had acquired the rare title of Grammaticus by which he is distinguished.[2] As one of the accusers of John XII., Benedict had signed the Act of Deposition. He had, however, appeared at the February Synod which condemned the imperialist Pope. In him the Romans beheld the man who would bravely defend the liberty of the Church against the Imperial power. In defiance of the Emperor's prohibition the

[1] *In temporibus adeo a diabolo est percussus, ut infra dierum octo spacium eodem sit vulnere mortuus.* Liutprand, c. 19, and similarly the Vita in Murat, III. 2, p. 326 (*Cod. Vat.* 3764) know nothing of the circumstance.—*Nam.* 2, *Id. Maii—excessit*, says *Cont. Regin.* John XII. was, moreover, buried with every honour in the Lateran. His epitaph in the customary official phrases (printed in Adinolfi, Roma —di mezzo I. 197), has been preserved. It begins:

Quam solers Domino placuit quam mente modesta
Praesul apostolicus orbis et omne decus,
Hic statuit tumulo claudi sua membra sub isto,
Haec eadem sperans ut sibi reddat humus.

[2] *Erat enim vir prudentiss. grammatice artis imbutus, unde ad Romanum populo Benedictus grammaticus est appellatus.* Ben. of Soracte, c. 37; and Gerbert, *Conc. Remens.*, c. 28.

elected candidate was consecrated and ascended the Apostolic Chair as Benedict V.

Envoys from the Roman people had hastened to Otto at Rieti to inform him of the recent Papal election and to implore his ratification. Otto had explained that he would return in company with Leo, their lawful Pope, and would punish the city did it refuse him obedience. He now departed for Rome. The villages belonging to the Roman territory were pillaged and devastated by his troops; the city itself was besieged. As Otto lay encamped before the walls and demanded the surrender of Benedict, he appeared in the light of an Emperor requiring the obedience of a city which he had subjugated. The Romans, however, only recognised a despot who had come to rob them of the last remains of independence, of the right which they had inherited from their ancestors—the right of electing a pope. The infamy of John XII. was wiped out. A pious man had been elected as his successor, and the Imperial ratification was implored. But could Otto set aside Leo VIII., who had been elected by a Council with his consent? Could the Romans, on the other hand, now renounce the attempt to maintain against the new Emperor their ancient right of election without admitting themselves to be deserving of slavery? Their Pope mounted the walls and encouraged the defenders to resistance. Famine raged in the city, and repeated attacks completely shook the courage of the besieged. They opened the gates on June 23: they surrendered Benedict V. and again swore obedience at S. Peter's grave. They awaited a

Otto I. conducts Leo VIII. back to Rome.

He besieges Rome.

merciless punishment. The Emperor, however, granted them an amnesty.[1]

After his entry Leo VIII. assembled a Council in the Lateran at Otto's command. The unfortunate Pope of the Romans, clad in pontifical vestments, was led into the Hall of Council. The Archdeacon asked by what right he had ventured to assume the insignia of the sacred dignity, since his master and Pope Leo, in whose election on the deposition of John he had himself taken part, was still alive. He was further charged with having broken his oath to his sovereign and Emperor here present never to elect a pope without his consent. "If I have sinned," answered Benedict, "have pity upon me." And he stretched out his hands in entreaty. Otto burst into tears. The Roman Church, once under Nicholas I., so formidable a tribunal for kings, now lay at the feet of the Empire. Otto addressed an intercession in favour of Benedict to the Synod. The anti-pope clung to his knees. Leo VIII. cut his pallium in two, took the ferule from his hands, broke it asunder, commanded Benedict to sit upon the ground, tore the papal vestments from him, and deprived him of every spiritual dignity. He condemned the anti-pope to perpetual exile, and only to please the Emperor did he allow him to retain the rank of deacon.[2]

Benedict V. is deposed.

The Papal Chair had long been at the mercy of the city factions. Even women had appointed popes,

[1] *Dimisit autem eis quanta et qualia mala perpessus est ab illis Chron. Farf.*, p. 476.

[2] Liutprand's *Historia Ottonis* closes with the Acts of this Synod.

and the degradation of the sacred office had reached its lowest depth in the grandson of Marozia. The Emperor, therefore, in wresting the right of election out of the hands of the rude nobility had rendered the Church a true service. The corruption of the city constituted him its Dictator; he therefore arrogated to himself as an Imperial right the privilege of filling every appointment. He was accustomed to nominate bishops according to his pleasure in Germany. Never had Emperor obtained a like victory. Owing to his personal energy and the energy of his successors—whose example he became—the Papacy was rendered subject to the Empire, and the Church of Rome became a vassal of Germany. The Imperial power attained a tremendous height. The Papacy, however, though repressed by the majesty of great rulers, revenged itself, while (in obedience to Nature's laws of change) it not only regained its lost freedom, but overstepped its previous limits with gigantic strides. The struggle of the Church with the German Empire was the greatest work of the Middle Ages,—the drama which convulsed the world.

The honourable attempt of the Romans to preserve their right of election fell a sacrifice to a higher necessity. In order to reform Rome and the Church it was necessary that the German monarchy should assume the dictatorship over them for a time. The humiliated city had accepted the Emperor as its ruler; the Imperial Pope was reinstated, and it is therefore probable that Otto, instead of being satisfied with an oath, now issued a decree commanding

the absolute renunciation of the elective rights on the part of the Romans, and that his creature Leo VIII. acquiesced in carrying out his design. A charter of this nature in the imperfect diction of the eleventh century has been preserved, but its authenticity is open to grave doubts, evident falsifications in favour of Imperial rights having placed its true import beyond recognition.[1]

Charter of Leo VIII. respecting the Papal Election.

[1] I have compared the Privileg. Leo VIII. (*Ivo Panorm. VIII.* 135, *Gratian. Decret.* 63, c. 23, *Mon. Germ.*, Leg. II. 167) in the *Cod. Vat.* 1984, fol. 192, where also, fol. 191, the spurious Privileg. of Adrian I. is found. It gives the Emperor the power of choosing Pope, King, Patricius and Bishops, *ut ipsi tamen ab eo investituram suscipiant, et consecrationem recipiant undecunque pertinuerit—soli regi romani imperii hanc reverentiae tribuimus potestatem.* Flosz has published a manuscript of Treves, of saec. XI. or XII., in which he seeks to recognise the original Privilege of Leo VIII. This clumsy document rather appears to be a rhetorical production. The grounds for the spuriousness of the diploma are given by Baronius, Pagi, Muratori, Curtius, Pertz, Dönniges, Giesebrecht, Hinschius, Kirchenrecht. A second spurious Privilegium of Leo VIII. in *Baron.*, and *Mon. Germ.* Leg. II. 168, agreeing with the *Vita Leo VIII.* in *Bern. Guidonis* and *Amalricus Aug.*, according to which the Pope ceded the State of the Church, is only valuable on account of the specification of the regions of the city.—See E. Bernheim, *Das unechte Decret Hadrians I. im Zusammenhange mit den unecht. Decreten Leo's VIII., als Documente des Investiturstreits* (*Forsch. z. D. Gesch.*, Bd xv., 1875, p. 618 *f.*).

4. Otto returns to Germany—Death of Leo in the Spring of 965—John XIII., Pope—His Family—His Banishment—Otto marches against Rome—The Pope is again seized—Barbarous punishment of the Rebels—The Caballus Constantini—Lament for the fall of Rome into the power of the Saxons.

Having celebrated the festival of S. Peter, Otto left the city on July 1, 964. He took with him Benedict V., whom he afterwards sent in exile to Hamburg. Leo VIII., who remained behind in Rome under such grievous conditions, was released by death from his hopeless fate in the spring of 965. The Romans dared no longer assemble for the election of a new pope. On the contrary, they sent Azzo and Marinus, Bishop of Sutri, to Germany, and resigned the election to the Emperor. Their own wishes were centred on Benedict V., the man of their choice, and they hoped that the Emperor might ratify his election. Benedict, however, died on July 4, 965, at Hamburg, where, under the custody of Bishop Adaldag, he had led a saintly life,[1] and Otto was thus released from the difficulty of refusing the request of the Romans. He courteously dismissed their ambassadors and sent the Bishops Otger of Spiers and Liutprand of Cremona to Rome.

Otto leaves Rome, July 1, 964.

The choice fell on the Bishop of Narni, who was

John XIII., Pope, 965–972.

[1] *Cont. Regin.* says nothing of the entreaties of the Romans; Adam of Bremen, however (*Mon. Germ.* ix. 309), speaks of them. Benedict V.'s body was afterwards brought to Rome. See Thietmar, who praises him greatly (*Chron.* IV. c. 40).

elected to the Papal Chair on October 1, 965. John XIII., son of another John, Bishop of Narni, had been educated in the Lateran. He had here mounted in succession the various steps of the ecclesiastical ladder, and had acquired respect by his learning.[1] In the November Synod he had been one of the accusers of John XII., and had also signed the deposition of Leo VIII., in whose elevation he must have unwillingly acquiesced. He was of distinguished Roman family and nearly related to the Senatrix Stephania, whom he later invested with the fief of Palestrina. He also effected a marriage between Benedict (her son by the count of the same name) and Theodoranda, daughter of Crescentius of the Marble Horse, and then made Benedict Rector of the Sabina.[2] After the fall of

[1] *Catalog. Eccardi* and *Vitae Cod. Vat.* 1437, 3764; Ughelli (I. 1013) rightly calls the Bishop of Narni John, the son wrongly Sergius. Catalog. I. in the Cod. Vat. 3764 has correctly *sed. ann. vi. m. xi. d. v.*; the second or the continuation of Anastasius, wrongly says *ann. vii.* (*m. xi d. v.*).

[2] Hugo of Farfa (*Mon. Germ.* xiii. 540): *Joh. igitur papa qui appellatus est major, ingressus papaticum satis exaltavit quendam nepotem suum nomine Benedictum, deditque ei Theodorandam uxorem satis nobilem, filiam Crescentii qui vocatur a Caballo marmoreo, et comitatum Sabinensem dedit ei et plures alios.* Another Theodoranda was the daughter of the Consul Gratian, whom I hold to have been the husband of Theodora II., and was married to Ingebald, Rector of the Sabina. Wilmans believes the former to have been the daughter of Crescentius, who was executed in 998; the supposition, however, cannot be proved, and is at variance with the dates of the persons. Benedict was still rector of the Sabina in 998. His sons John and Crescentius are found from 1010 as lords of Palestrina, with which Stephania had been invested in the year 970. Count Benedict appears as husband of Stephania in 987 (Dipl. III. in Nerini, p. 381), whose son was probably the nephew of John XIII. Stephania must therefore have been the sister of the Pope. Petrini, *Mem. Prenest.* p. 104. Was

the house of Alberic, the family of Crescentius entered on its illustrious career. John XIII. himself exalted it in order thereby to secure a support against the nobility, with whom he forthwith quarrelled. He endeavoured by a closer approach to the Emperor to free himself from the influence of the nobility; but the result was a conspiracy formed against himself.[1] At its head stood Peter the City Prefect, and the sudden mention of a Prefect proves that the illustrious office had been restored by the Emperor.[2] With Peter was Roffred, Count of the Campagna, who it would appear was a highly influential man, the Vestiarius Stephen, many of the nobility and many of the populace. The standard-bearers of the militia seized the Pope on December 16 and threw him into S. Angelo, whence they carried him to Campania, probably to Roffred's castle.[3] The revolt possessed a demo-

Rebellion against John XIII., headed by Peter, Prefect of the city.

she as Senatrix the daughter of Theodora II.? Did John belong to the family of Alberic?

[1] *Qui statim majores Romanorum elatiore animo quam oporteret insequitur, quo in brevi inimicissimos et infestos patitur. Contin. Reginonis, A.* 965.

[2] A leaden bull, which entirely corresponds to those of the Popes in the 9th and 10th centuries, must have reference to him; on the obverse PETRVS round a Greek cross; on the reverse PRAEFECTVS round a star with eight rays. Marini has described this bull (Cod. Vat. 9071, p. 185); see thereon De Rossi, *Di una Bolla Plumbea Papale del sec. incirca X. scoperta nel Foro Romano, Notizie degli Scavi maggio*, 1882. This Peter was probably a son of the above-named John Mizina; since in a deed of Corneto, of November 10, 1144, reference is made to a previous time, where *Petrus Praefectus quond. Johannis Michini* first possessed Corneto. Wüstenfeld, *Regesten der wichtigeren Urkunden zur Geschichte von Corneto*, in the *Iter Italicum* of Pflugk-Hartung, 1884, ii. 533.

[3] *Vita Joh. XIII. e Cod. Vat.* (1437): *comprehensus est a Roffredo*

cratic character, for the leader of the common people (*vulgus populi*) appeared beside the City Prefect. And since the loss of the elective privilege must have involved Rome in a state of continuous revolution, it further signified the release of Rome from the Papal government, as also from the yoke of the foreigner. But this outbreak of despair was also destined to a tragic end.

Otto came to Italy in the autumn of 966. He first punished rebellious Lombardy, where the unfortunate Adalbert had again ventured on war, and again been forced to fly to Corsica and to wander restlessly hither and thither. As the Emperor again advanced on Rome, his approach produced a counter revolution. John, son of Crescentius, and the followers of the banished Pope, rose in rebellion; Roffred and Stephen were slain, the Prefect was forced to fly; the Pope was recalled. John XIII. was now at Capua, under the protection of Count Pandulf, to whom he had fled or been allowed to go. With a Capuan escort he entered the Sabina, where his nephew Benedict, step-son of Crescentius of the Marble Horse, ruled as Count, and after an exile of ten months and twenty-eight days he entered the city on November 12.[1]

Soon after Otto also arrived. Although the city

Campanino Comite cum Petro Praefecto, et adjutorio Vulgi Populi qui vocantur Decarcones, recluserunt eum in Castello S. Angeli. Cont. Regin. Bened. of Soracte, c. 30, after having comically described the ill-treatment of the prisoner (*alii percutiebant, caput ejus, alii alapas in facies ejus percutiebat, alii nautes nutis cruciebantur*). *Sic—in Campanie finibus inclusus.*

[1] Ben. of Soracte, c. 39. The Pope had won over the Capuans by raising Capua to an archbishopric.

offered no resistance, his troops did not now spare the inhabitants, and we do not doubt that on this occasion Rome was both sacked and stained with the blood of her citizens. The indignant Emperor resolved to punish the heads of the rebellion with severity. The more conspicuous offenders, men bearing the title of Consul, were banished to Germany. Twelve leaders of the people, called in ancient documents *Decarcones*—possibly Captains of the Regions—expiated their love of freedom on the gallows. Several were executed or blinded.[1] Barbarous and strange as the age itself was the punishment inflicted on Peter the City-Prefect, who had been dragged a prisoner to the dungeons of the Lateran. The Emperor handed him over to the Pope and John caused him to be hanged by his hair from the

Otto I. punishes the Romans, 966.

[1] *Vita Joh. XIII.: de vulgi populo, qui vocantur Decarcones duodecim suspendit in patibulis.* The word *Decarcones* is only used in this *vita*. Regino counts 13 *ex marjoribus Romanor.*, without the prefects. Cod. Estens. only gives 11, and Muratori has the variants *decartores*, *decartiones*, *decuriones*. In the Cod. Vat. 1437 I clearly read *decarcones*. Giesebrecht holds them to have been members of the *Vulgus populi* or *viri humiles*, which is contradicted by the epithet *majores* in Regino. They were, nevertheless, leaders of the populace. If the word should be read *Decarchontes*, then is it a translation of *Decemprimi*. *Decarcones*, or rather *Decariones* as it must be read, arose, according to my view, from *decem capi* (*tanei*) *regionum*, which the people joined together into *de-cariones*, as men afterwards said *i caporioni*, or in Orvieto *anterioni*. The *i* in *riones* might easily be transformed into a *c* in writing. In 1148 there were in Viterbo "Tenmen" or *Capudece* (Orioli in the *Giorn. Arcadico*, t. 137, p. 257). Since Regino counted 13 *ex majorib. Romanor.*, the 13th belonged to Trastevere. There were 12 standard-bearers in saec. xii. and xiii. also. In Henry V.'s time the *draconarii* were still distinguished from the *aquiliferi*, *leoniferi*, *lupiferi*, so that Hegel's view (I. 315), that the right reading is *Draconarii*, standard-bearers, is untenable.

equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, the "Caballus Constantini." Thus by a singular accident a celebrated monument of antiquity emerges out of the darkness of the time.

The Caballus Constantini.

This renowned work of art still survives as the most beautiful ornament of the Capitol. The traveller looks upon it with reverence, remembering the seventeen centuries which have passed over the bronze Emperor, who with outstretched arm sits his horse in majestic sadness, and who may possibly remain there while another like period of history runs its course. Created while the power of the Caesars was at its height, the statue has witnessed the fall of the Empire and the growth of the Papacy in Rome. Goths, Vandals, Heruli, Byzantines, Germans intent on pillage and slaughter, have passed it by and spared it. The rapacious Constans II. looked on it and left it unheeded. Temples and basilicas have fallen around it. Colonnades and monuments have been overthrown. The statue itself has remained unharmed like the solitary genius of Rome's great past. Its name, however, had been forgotten, and after the equestrian statue of Constantine on the Arch of Severus had been destroyed, it was baptised in the name of the Emperor who had been so great a benefactor to the Church. A rude legend concerning its origin had arisen. Pilgrims related how Rome had been besieged by a foreign king at the Lateran Gate, while the Consuls still ruled the city. A gigantic armour-bearer, or a peasant, had offered to deliver it in its straits, but had demanded the sum of thirty thousand sesterces and a gilt equestrian statue in

return for his services. The Senate consented. He mounted a horse without a saddle, a sickle in his hand. An owl had reported to him where the king was to be found every night at the foot of a tree. He seized the king and carried him off, while the Romans attacked the enemy's camp and possessed themselves of their treasures. The Senate bestowed the promised reward on the liberator, and ordered a horse of gilt bronze without a saddle, on which the rider was represented, the right hand (with which he had taken the king) outstretched. An image of the owl was placed on the horse's head, and the king himself with bound hands underneath his hoofs.[1]

The statue of Marcus Aurelius therefore stood in good preservation on the Lateran field (the Campus Lateranensis) in the tenth century.[2] The Lateran basilica was one of Constantine's foundations. The Patriarchium had been his palace, and it was consequently believed that the equestrian statue was a portrait of this great Emperor. Several memorials

[1] *Et equum aeneum pro memoria deauratum et sine sella, ipso desuper residente, extensa manu dextera quae ceperat Regem.* Mirabilia and Graphia. The horse has a tuft of hair on its forehead, which the popular imagination transformed into an owl; and it is possible that a fettered prisoner of war may originally have been represented underneath the horse. The legend probably belongs to the X. saec. In 966 a Prefect of the city was hanged on this statue, and in 1847 the Italian Tricolour was placed in the hand of the same Marcus Aurelius.

[2] The *Vita Joh. XIII.* does not specify the site of the equestrian statue: *per capillos capitis eum suspendit in caballum Constantini.* The same *Vita* and *Catal. Eccardi*, however, have in the Life of John XIV.: *in Campum ante Caballum Constantini.* The expression *Campus* so frequently used of the Latern Field has misled Fea and others into thinking of the Campo Vaccino.

and monuments of ancient Rome had already found refuge in the Lateran. As early as the tenth century the bronze group of the nursing wolf had been placed in one of the Halls, where tribunals were held under the presidency of the Imperial Missi, and from the group this hall received the name *ad Lupam*.[1]

We return, however, to the Prefect, whom we left hanging by his hair. Removed from this position, he was placed backwards and naked upon an ass, the tail of which, furnished with a bell, he had to grasp as reins. A sack of feathers was placed on his head, two similar sacks were fastened to his thighs, and he was thus led through Rome. He was finally exiled beyond the Alps. Revenge was exercised even upon the dead. The bodies of Count Roffred and the Vestiarius Stephen were taken from their graves by Imperial command and thrown outside the walls. This act of severity aroused horror and indignation within the city, surprise and sympathy without, and hatred among all the enemies of the Empire. John XIII. alone had reason for gratitude towards Otto. He calls him the liberator and restorer of the tottering Church, the illustrious guest and thrice blessed Emperor.[2] The Romans nevertheless could

[1] *Libell. de Imp. Potest.*, p. 720: *in judiciali loco ad Lateranis, ubi dicitur ad Lupam, quae mater vocabatur Romanor.* This is copied by Benedict of Soracte, *cap.* 24. The she-wolf stood there until 1471, when it was brought to the Capitol. The Lateran. *Catasto* of 1450 mentions the house, in which *la lupa et opera de metallo* stood: Fleury, *Le Latran*, p. 498. Stevenson, *Annali d. Inst.* 1877, p. 380.

[2] Mansi (*Concil.* xviii. 509) in the Ravennese bull of the institution of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg: *Roma caput totius mundi et ecclesia universalis ab iniquis pene pessum data, a Domno Ottone aug. Imp., a Deo coronato Caesare, et magno, et ter benedicto—erecta est, et in*

never learn to bend to the power of the foreign kings, who crossed the Alps at the head of their armies to obtain a crown and title in S. Peter's, wherewith to rule their city. It was in silent resentment that they submitted to the power of the Saxon house. No poet was forthcoming to describe the fate of the illustrious city, as it had been described in the time of their ancestors.[1] The monk of Soracte, however, who closes his chronicle with the arrival of the indignant Otto with his "immense army of Gauls," drops his pen, overcome with emotion, and bursts into a lament. His wail, although uttered in barbarous and stammering accents, is inspired by genuine feeling, and as such awakes our sympathy.

Lament of Benedict of Soracte over Rome.

"Woe to Rome! oppressed and down-trodden by so many nations! Thou art taken captive by the Saxon king, thy people are judged by the sword. Thy strength is become as naught. Thy gold and thy silver are carried away in their purses. Thou, who wast a mother, art now become a daughter. What thou didst possess, thou hast lost. Thou art robbed of thy first youth. In the time of Pope Leo thou wert overcome by the first Julius. In the might of

pristinum honorem omni reverentia redacta. The Greeks also acknowledged that Rome was a Papal city: *νῦν δὲ ἐγένετο ἡ καινοτομία αὕτη διὰ τὸ τὴν Ῥώμην ἀποθέσθαι τὸ βασιλέων κράτος, καὶ ἰδιοκρατορίαν ἔχειν καὶ δεσπόζεσθαι κυρίως παρά τινος κατὰ καιρὸν παπα.* Const. Porphyr., *De Thematib.*, ii. 27 (ed Bonn.).

[1] A poet about 1000 causes the Queen of the World to repeat the following lines:—

Enitui facie toto memorabilis orbe . . .
Et post delicias semino nunc lachrymas.

Cod. Casin. 451. p. 326; *Di Costanzo, Mem. di S. Rufino*, p. 423, in De Rossi, *Piante icnogr. di Roma*, p. 77.

thy power thou hast triumphed over nations, hast cast the world into the dust, hast strangled the kings of the earth. Thou hast borne the sceptre and the great power. Thou hast been utterly plundered and ravaged by the Saxon king. As some wise men said, and as it will be found written in thy histories, thou hast formerly fought with foreign nations and been victorious from north to south. The people of Gaul have taken possession of thee. Thou wast too beautiful. All thy walls with towers and battlements were as it is found. Thou hadst three hundred and eighty-one towers, forty-six forts, six thousand eight hundred battlements: thy gates were fifteen. Woe to the Leonine city! long since wert thou taken, but now thou art desolated by the Saxon king." [1]

Such is the lament raised by an ignorant monk for the fall of Rome under the Saxons. From the lonely heights of Soracte the chronicler could look on the beauteous plains below, and watch the armed processions as they trooped year after year across the Campagna to attack the Eternal City and to fill it with blood and terror. In the changed conditions of Rome the lament of the monk cannot move us as did the elegies of his predecessors. We may, however, place his lamentation beside that of Jerome on the fall of the city under the Goths, beside that of Gregory

[1] *Ve Roma! quia tantis gentis oppressa et conculcata. Qui etiam a Saxone rege appreensa fuistis, et gladiati populi tui, et robor tua ad nichilum redacta est. Aurum et argentum tuum in illorum marsuppiis deportant.* The enumeration of the towers, &c., appears as the second since that of the Anon. of Einsiedeln. These enumerations are based essentially on the ancient registers, but this by no means excludes the newer buildings, especially the towers.

under the terror of the Lombards, and lastly beside the touching dirge over Rome's subjugation to the Byzantine yoke. Comparing it with these earlier elegies, we discover in the barbarism of its diction the depth to which the language and learning of the Romans had sunk in the tenth century.

CHAPTER IV.

I. Coronation of Otto II.—Embassy of Liutprand to Byzantium — Praeneste or Palestrina — The Senatrix Stephania receives the Investiture of this City in the year 970.

For six entire years affairs demanded Otto's presence in Italy, the country in which after him countless Germans were to win glory, but at the same time a bitter hatred and their graves. During his sojourn in Rome he had invested Pandulf, "the Iron-head," of Capua with Spoleto and Camerino. He had entrusted a faithful vassal with the fairest domains of Southern Italy, and had made over to him the war with Byzantium, which still continued. He celebrated the Easter of 967 in Ravenna with Pope John, and in a Council restored this city with its territory and other patrimonies to the Church.[1] He then brought his son to Italy in order to secure the succession in his family and to make the Italian kingdom hereditary like the Empire.

Otto II., crowned co-Emperor, Dec. 25, 967.

Otto II. entered the city with his father on December 24, and on Christmas Day received the Imperial Crown at the hands of John XIII.[2]

[1] *Cont. Reginonis, A.* 967.

[2] *Annal. Saxo, A.* 967, and letter of Otto I. to the Dukes of Saxony,

The ideas cherished by his father influenced the mind of the boy of fourteen, who suddenly found himself a Caesar standing amid the monuments of world history. The restoration of the Western Roman Empire was the goal of Otto's policy; the subjugation of Rome and the Papacy, the expulsion of Greeks and Arabs from Italy, the unification of the divided country, were the steps by which he hoped to attain his end. An alliance, such as the great Charles had once desired, was formed with Constantinople. Otto was anxious to bestow lustre on his youthful dynasty by intermarriage with the royal house of Greece. The Greek Emperor, however, regarded with jealousy the restoration of the Western Empire and the growing power of the German king in Italy, where the princes of Benevento and Capua already obeyed Otto as vassals. The fugitive sons of Berengar found shelter at Byzantium, and these princes might have easily kindled a war in Calabria, as the pretender Adelchis had previously attempted to do. Otto sent an embassy to Nicephorus Phocas to conclude peace and to solicit the hand of the daughter of Romanus II. for his son. His envoy was the most brilliant Italian of the age. Liutprand had been the courtier and flatterer of Hugo, Berengar and Otto in succession, and since 962 Bishop of Cremona. His unusual knowledge of the Greek language, his wit and courtier-

dat. XV. Kal. Febr. in Campania juxta Capuam, which ends: *Filius noster in nativitate Domini coronam a beato apostolico in imperii dignitatem suscepit.* On Dec. 2, Otto I. was already in Rome, on Dec. 7 in Ostia, on Dec. 23 he was again in Rome. See the documents for these dates in Stumpf, *Die Reichskanzler*, 38, 39.

like tact qualified him for the most difficult of all embassies of the time. He wrote a minute account of his mission to Otto, and this account, which we still possess, forms one of the most amusing records of the age. The Bishop gives a picture of the Byzantine Court, which, although perhaps occasionally coloured by malice, is drawn with lively insight and remains in the highest degree valuable. We quote it therefore, so far as it refers to Rome and the Romans.[1]

Liutprand Envoy to Byzantium.

Liutprand reached the capital of the East on June 4, 968. He was at length admitted to an audience of Nicephorus Phocas, the renowned conqueror of Crete. The vain courtier found himself in the presence of a sovereign of rude but vigorous and heroic type, who condescended to bestow a few words upon him. He revenged himself for his contemptuous treatment by drawing the portrait of a monster. The Emperor addressing him said: "We desired to receive you with splendour and magnanimity; the impiety of your sovereign does not, however, allow us to do so. He has made himself master of Rome by hostile invasion; he has, contrary to right, deprived Adalbert and Berengar of life. He has killed, blinded or banished the Romans, and has presumed to overcome the cities of our Empire by fire and sword."[2] The Bishop, who remained unembarrassed, urged in reply

[1] *Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolit.*, last printed in *Mon. Germ.*, v. 347. This splendid pamphlet, full of life, encounters us like an oasis in the midst of a desert of literature. Since leaving Procopius behind we have not met anything similar to it.

[2] Cap. 4. The imprisoned Berengar had died in 966 at Bamberg; Adalbert, however, still lived, so that the speech is inaccurate.

to these accusations that Otto had delivered Rome from the rule of dissolute women and insolent aristocrats, and assured Nicephorus that sentence of execution had only been passed upon perjured rebels and in accordance with the laws of Justinian. In his further dealings, he explained that Otto had restored all the Church property in his Empire to the Pope, and he referred to the Donation of Constantine, at this time esteemed genuine. The pride of the Greek Emperor, the sanctity of his person, the claims of ancient legitimacy to power over Rome and Italy, the contempt for the barbarian, the unwieldy and theatrical ceremonial of the Court, are attractively described. We may, however, be permitted to doubt whether Liutprand actually displayed the courageous independence of which he boasts. As Basil had formerly refused the Imperial title of *Basileus* to Lewis II., so Nicephorus now refused it to Otto, according him merely that of *Rex*.[1] Nicephorus still considered himself sole Roman Emperor, and Liutprand was thrown into no slight dismay when a letter of John XIII. reached Constantinople addressed in audacity or ignorance to "the Emperor of the Greeks." At table, whither Nicephorus condescendingly, and with an ill-concealed contempt, invited Otto's ambassador, he one day taunted Liutprand with the reproach that those who in Italy now called themselves Romans were barbarians or Lombards. "The true Romans," answered the Lombard, "were

[1] [*Ipse enim vos non imperatorem, id est* βασιλέα, *sua lingua, sed ob indignationem* ῥῆγα, *id est regem, nostra vocabat.* Liutpr., *Leg.*, c. 2. —TRANSLATOR.

descended from the fratricide Romulus and from robbers. We, however, Lombards, Saxons, Franks, Lotharingians, Bavarians, Swabians, Burgundians, despise the Romans to such a degree that when we wish to insult our enemies we call them 'Romans,' for by this name we denote all that is ignoble, cowardly, covetous, sensual and false."[1] The Greeks smiled; they hated fallen Rome, and since they dared not openly express the hope of recovering the city from the barbarians, they assured the envoys that Constantine had brought the Senate and the Roman knights to Byzantium, and had only left the dregs of the population behind.

Otto II. is refused the hand of Theophano.

Meanwhile, when Liutprand demanded the hand of the Emperor's step-daughter Theophano for Otto's son, he was answered: "If you surrender what belongs to us, you shall obtain your desire. Give us therefore Ravenna and Rome and all the land that lies between these cities and our provinces. Will your lord enter into an alliance without cementing it by marriage, then let him restore freedom to Rome." To the argument, that Otto had made the Church richer than it had previously been, while the Byzantine government had not restored the patrimonies which it had annexed, the Imperial minister replied that the Emperor would do as desired as soon as he

[1] *Hoc solo i. e. Romanorum nomine quidquid ignobilitatis, quicquid timiditatis, quicquid avaritiae, q. luxuriae, q. mendacii, immo q. vitiorum est, comprehendentes* . . . c. 12. With reference to this passage we may remember the verdict of Salvian, who 500 years before Liutprand was forced to say: *nomen civium Romanorum aliquando—magno aestimatum—nunc—nec vile tantum, sed etiam abominabile pene habetur.*

ruled Rome and the Roman bishopric according to his will.[1] Liutprand did not attain his object. Ridiculed and ill-treated by the subtle Greeks, after countless insults, which he described with more humour than he endured them, the vain bishop gladly quitted Constantinople towards the end of the year 968.

We shall not follow Otto's movements in Italy. We find him making war now in Calabria, now in Ravenna and Pavia; at Christmas 970, however, he is back again in Rome. The city now bore the Imperial yoke without resistance. No event of importance is recorded in its history for some years after the cruel sentences which we have described. A diploma of John XIII., however, concerning a celebrated city deserves attention. The ancient Praeneste, twenty-four miles distant from Rome, whence it may be seen on the slopes of the mountain by the naked eye, still retained its name and the ruins of its ancient magnificence.[2] Legends of poets and deeds of history graced the hoary city of the Siculi. Here the youthful Marius had fallen on his sword: Sulla had reduced the city to ruins over the corpses of its inhabitants, and had then built the sumptuous temple to Fortune. Here Fulvia had defied Octavian,

Praeneste.

[1] *Faceret cum ad nutum suum Roma, et R. Ecclesia ordinabitur.* Byzantium was indignant that Otto ruled as sovereign over Ravenna and Rome. Otto had even built a palace at Ravenna in 970; Placitum of Otto II., A. 971, *Chron. Farf.* 475.

[2] The people already called it *Penestrina*. *In territorio Penestrino.* Document, A. 998, in Marini, n. 106. Or *Pelestrina*: Document in Galletti, *Gabio*, p. 67, A. 873. Hugo of Farfa still said: *mons Penestrinus*; A. 1074, the phrase is *in Territorio Pelestrino* (Bullar., *Casin.* II., const. cxii.).

and with Fulvia was Livia, first the enemy, afterwards the wife of Augustus. The balmy air of Praeneste had cured the dissolute Tiberius. Emperors, poets, all worshippers of Fortune—Ovid, Horace, Virgil—loved the laurel-crowned city sacred to the Goddess. It had fallen to decay in barbarian times; its temples, basilicas and theatres had perished or stood in ruins, and the splendid masterpieces of three different periods of antiquity lay buried in dust.[1]

Praeneste had, however, become one of the seven suffragan bishoprics of Rome. Agapitus, a saintly youth, had here suffered martyrdom on August 28, 274, and was now worshipped as patron of the city in the cathedral which had arisen on the ruins of the Temple of Fortune. John now bestowed the town in hereditary lease on the Senatrix Stephania. Praeneste was to belong to her, her children and grandchildren, for a rent of ten gold solidi, but it was afterwards to return to the Church. The document affords us an example of the introduction of the system of feudal tenure into Roman territory.[2]

John XIII. invests the Senatrix Stephania with Praeneste, 978.

We shall presently encounter the descendants of Stephania in possession of Palestrina, and shall frequently return to the city in dealing with the history of family wars of the eleventh century.

[1] The celebrated picture in mosaic, excavated at Palestrina in 1640, is still the treasure of the baronial castle. The excavations in Palestrina have yielded many Etruscan articles of toilette; the gem of the Kircherian Museum in Rome, the *Cista Mystica*, was brought from Palestrina. Need I also remind the reader that the ruins of Praeneste, on these enchanting heights, gave birth to the genius of modern Italian music?

[2] Diploma in Petrini, App. 394; Marini, n. 32; Murat., *Ant. It.*, iii.

2. MARRIAGE OF THEOPHANO WITH OTTO II. IN ROME—BENEDICT VI., POPE, 973—DEATH OF OTTO THE GREAT—AGITATION IN ROME—FAMILY OF THE CRESCENTII—THE CABALLI MARMOREI—ROMAN SURNAMES AT THIS PERIOD—CRESCENTIUS DE THEODORA—FALL OF BENEDICT VI.—FERRUCIUS RAISED TO THE PAPAL CHAIR AS BONIFACE VII.—HIS SUDDEN FLIGHT—OBSCURE END OF CRESCENTIUS.

The successor of Nicephorus willingly granted the request which Nicephorus himself had refused. Exactly a year after his departure the malicious Liutprand may have rejoiced to hear that the mighty ruler of the Eastern Empire had fallen by the swords of assassins. John Zimisces, who had brought the murderers into the palace, ascended the Greek throne on Christmas Day, 969. He received in a friendly spirit the ambassadors sent by Otto to congratulate him, and the daughter of the younger Romanus became the betrothed of Otto II. This princess had witnessed in her youth the most hideous tragedies committed in her own home. She

235: *Joannes Ep. Serv. Servor. Dei dilectissime in Dom. Filie Stephanie carissime Senatricis tuisque filiis ac nepotibus.* The chronological dates are not entirely accurate. The concession was *tertii generis.* The Church both before and after this time leased places; thus Boniface VII. leased the fortress of Pietrapertusa for 10 gold solidi. Deusdedit, in Borgia, App. VI.—A document in Nerini, p. 381, speaks of the Senatrix and Comitissa Stephania and her husband Count Benedict: they presented the convent of S. Alessio with a farm *juxta portum Asture.*

had seen her father die of poison, mixed for him by her mother, the Empress Theophano; she had seen this mother, first in the arms of Nicephorus and afterwards in those of his murderer Zimisces, who, once possessed of the bloody crown, banished the adulteress to the solitude of an Armenian convent.[1] Accustomed to the skies, the language and the arts of the East, the youthful Theophano reluctantly departed for the West, to live among the iron warriors of Saxony, in cities whose climate and want of civilisation gave them an aspect of barbarism.

The Imperial bride came under the escort of Gero, Archbishop of Cologne, two bishops, and several counts and dukes. She landed in Apulia and entered Rome, where the bridegroom awaited her, on April 14, 972. The young Caesar was only seventeen years old, boyish and attractive in appearance, highly educated, brave and amiable, concealing within a slight and diminutive body the soul of a hero.[2] The girlish bride, little more than sixteen years of age, was beautiful and intellectual. To the hands of this pair the already ageing Otto confided the future of the empire. John XIII. crowned Theophano on the 14th April, and the marriage took place immediately after in the presence of an assemblage of the nobles of Germany, Italy, and Rome.[3] Brilliant festivals were given in honour of

Theophano married to Otto II., and crowned April 14, 972.

[1] Theophano, mother of the princess of the same name, was the daughter of an innkeeper in Constantinople, and of such surpassing beauty that Romanus II. had made her his wife.

[2] *In parvo corpore maxima Virtus. Vita S. Adalberti*, c. 8.

[3] *Annal. Lobiens.*; *Annal. Saxo*; *Annal. Hildesh.*, *A.* 972. *Benedicti Chron.*, v. 718.

the occasion. Now that for the first time an Emperor of the West was united to a Byzantine princess, a reconciliation seemed to have been effected between Rome and Constantinople. But the splendour of the union brought no real advantage. Its fruit was a child prodigy, who, imbued with an almost morbid preference for Greece and Rome, looked with contempt on his own country. The Imperial family returned to Germany after the marriage festivities, and John XIII. soon afterwards died on September 6, 972.[1]

Benedict VI., Pope, 973–984.

His successor was Benedict VI., the son of Hildebrand, a Roman of German ancestry. He had previously been deacon in the Eighth Region, now no longer known as *Forum Romanorum*, but as *Sub Capitolio*. Owing to the absence of the Emperor, and the consequent delay of the ratification, Benedict was not ordained until January 19, 973.[2] His elevation had been the cause of a schism, for the Romans, notwithstanding the loss of their elective rights, continued to put forward candidates for the Papacy. The Imperial faction had proposed Benedict; the National party had, however, voted for

[1] He was buried in S. Paul's. His epitaph says at the end: *Hic vero summus Pont. Joannes in ap. Sede sedit annos septem. Depositionis ejus dies* 8. *Id. Sept. ab Incarn.* D. A., 972 (Baron., *ad* A. 972).

[2] *Cod. Estensis* (Murat., iii. 2, 332): *Benedict VI., diacon. de reg. VIII. sub capitolio ex patre Ildebrando monacho ingressus est m. Jan. d.* 19. *Hic fuit electus V. anno regis Ottonis, Ind. I., Domnus sedit a.* 1, *m.* 6. This is the passage out of which arose the imaginary Pope *Donus*, who has been inserted in later catalogues between Bened. VI. and Boniface.—Jaffé, p. 331; *Jahrb. d. D., Reichs*, ii. 2, von Giesebrecht, *Excurs.* viii.

Franco, son of Ferrucius. Benedict VI. became Pope, fear of the power of the old Emperor sufficing to keep Rome in check during his lifetime.

Death of Otto I., May 7, 973.

After having made Germany the most powerful country of Europe, the great monarch died on May 7, 973. The Romans immediately deserted the Pope, and hastened to bring forward their own candidate in his stead. The youth of Otto II., his absence in Germany, where he was obliged to secure the sovereignty, the promises of help on the part of the Byzantine commanders in Southern Italy gave courage to the Romans. The moment seemed to have arrived when it might be possible to recover their ancient rights, and perhaps obtain release from foreign rule.

The Crescentii become powerful.

The powerful family of the Crescentii stood at the head of the nationalists. Their ancestors, like the ancestors of Alberic, are unknown. They were, however, Romans of ancient family, the names Crescentius and Crescens appearing even in the days of the Empire, although scarcely before the third century. In the Placitum of Lewis III., of the year 901, the name of a Crescentius is mentioned for the first time. We observe it again among the nobles of Alberic, and have seen Crescentius of the Marble Horse take part in the November Synod of Otto I. The books of Farfa further mention the marriage of Theodoranda, daughter of this Crescentius, with Benedict, nephew of John XIII. Another John, probably son of the same Crescentius, led the counter revolution of 966.

The Caballi Marmorei.

The surname *a caballo marmoreo* is one of the

most remarkable in Rome. By the marble horse are understood the two colossal horses and their tamers, the celebrated masterpieces of antiquity which still stand on the Quirinal in front of the Baths of Constantine, and which apparently became the subject of a curious legend in the Mirabilia. In the tenth century the three statues of the Constantines, now on the Piazza of the Capitol, stood beside those of the horse tamers on the Quirinal. Ignorant pilgrims, looking on these naked giants and reading on their pedestals the names of the greatest Athenian sculptors,[1] transferred the names to the horse tamers themselves, and related the following legend:—"Once upon a time two young philosophers, Praxiteles and Phidias, came to the Emperor Tiberius,[2] who looking upon them asked in surprise: 'Why do you go about naked?' They answered: 'Because all before us is naked and clear to us, and we esteem the world as nought. Even what thou ponderest alone in thy chamber in the silence of the night can we repeat word for word.'

[1] It is probable that many statues bore such titles in ancient Rome. Thus in the Piazza Montanara a marble pedestal was discovered with the inscription: OPVS PRAXITELIS (*Bull. della Comm. Arch. Municip.*, ii. 174, 1874).

[2] *Duo philosophi juvenes.* In the *Passio SS. IV., Coronator.* along with *artifices*, five *philosophi* are mentioned as skilled in art, and the art of sculpture is called *ars philosophica.* O. Benndorf thence inferred that in mediaeval Latinity *philosophus* also signified sculptor.—*Archaol. Bemerk. zur Passio., SS. IV. Cor.*, in Büdinger's *Untersuch. zur Röm Kaisergesch*, iii. 343. On the other hand, see Lumbroso's explanation, who by *philosophi* understands only eminent and highly educated men.—*Atti dei Lincei*, v. 74 *f.* In Byzantium, Phidias and Praxiteles were regarded as jugglers and magicians: Sathas, Légende de Phidias, in the *Annuaire—des Études Grecques*, Paris, 1882, p. 143.

Tiberius replied: 'If you are indeed able to do this, then I will give you whatever you desire.' They answered: 'Money we do not desire, but a monument.' After they had revealed his inmost thoughts to the Emperor on the following day, Tiberius commanded their memorials to be erected, *i.e.* two prancing horses, symbols of the powerful rulers of the earth: a mightier king was, however, to come to mount the horses, that is, to subdue the power of the princes of the world. Half-naked men were therefore represented standing near the horses with their arms raised and their fists clenched. These men foretell the future, and, as they themselves are naked, so all knowledge lies naked before them. The woman who sits surrounded by serpents, and holding a bowl, signifies the Church, which is surrounded by many documents. No one, however, can understand these writings who has not previously bathed in that bowl." Such is the legend of the Caballi Marmorei. It consequently appears that close to the horse tamers stood a statue of Hygieia, with the serpent drinking out of a patera, and that this statue was popularly regarded as the symbol of the Church.[1]

Roman nicknames of this period.

Thus from the place of his dwelling Crescentius received a surname, which was later borne by other

[1] Mirabilia, *De Caballis Marmoreis in Roma.* The Romans said *a Caballo Marmoreo* in the singular. So too the Quirinal is called Monte Cavallo at the present day. Signorili also wrote in saec. XV.: *In clivio Caballi* (De Rossi, *Le prime raccolte*, p. 45). The *Anon* of Einsied. thus specified the horses: *Thermae Sallustianae, Sca Susanna et Cavalli Marmorei.* Buffalini's plan of the city (about 1551) marks them as standing beside the Baths of Constantine, before Sixtus V. in 1589 had them placed on the piazza of the Quirinal.

Romans also.[1] These Crescentii had undoubtedly erected a fortress for themselves in the ruins of the Thermae of Constantine, perhaps on the spot where the Palazzo Rospigliosi now stands. People often called themselves after the quarter where they dwelt, and since these quarters were usually marked by monuments, the Romans of the tenth century are frequently designated by curious sounding names. These names arrest our attention, recalling as they do the monuments of antiquity, and frequently forming our sole evidence of their continued existence. We thus encounter Romanus and Gregorius a Campo Martio, Johannes de Campo Rotundo, Sergius de Palatio, Benedictus a Macello sub Templo Marcelli (of the meat market under the theatre of Marcellus), Durantus a Via Lata, Ildebrando a Septem Viis, Gratianus a Balneo Miccino, Johannes a S. Angelo, Franco a S. Eustachio, Riccardo a Sancto Petro in Vincula, Petrus de Cannapara, Bonizo de Colossus, Andreas de Petro: all derived their names from the alleys of the Colosseum.[2] From these local

[1] A *Landolfo de caballo marmoreo*, A. 1005. *Reg. Sublac.*, fol. 156; and a *Beraldus et filius primus defensor de Cavallo Marmoreo, A.* 1014 (Galletti, *Dei. Prim.*, n. 30) seem to belong to this family. Again, in 1148, I find a *Senator Georgius ab equo marmoreo: Mscr. Vatican* of Galletti, n. 8043.—A. 1259 again *heredes Crescentii de caballo—Mscr.*, n. 8044, p. 31. Document of Alex. IV. of August 1, 1287—a *Lionardus cavalerio de cavallo; ibid.*

[2] *Andreas de Petro qui dicebatur de Viola Colosso testis.* Mittarelli, p. 235, dipl. 104, A. 1019.—The Cannapara was a street which in saec. x. and later lay in the Velabrum opposite S. Teodoro, between the Palatine and the Capitol. Casimiro, *Geschichte von Araceli*, p. 438. The name Cannapara is as yet unexplained; it probably referred to some ancient building. See Vol. V. An ancient church called S. Maria in Cannapara stood within it.

nicknames the family names of the nobility, such as S. Eustachio or Santo Statio, were occasionally derived. The populace, however, already named individuals after their peculiar characteristics, and in this way many proper names arose. Thus we find Crescentius Five-teeth; Adrian Short-neck; Benedict Sheepsmouth; John Hundred-swine; Leo Short-hose.[1] The custom likewise of naming the children after father or mother continued to exist; as, for instance, Stephanus de Imiza, Leo de Calo Johannes, Azone de Orlando, Benedictus de Abbatissa, Johannes de Presbytero, Crescentius de Theodora.

As early as the tenth century the name Crescentius was as common as the women's names, Stephania, Theodora, Marozia.[2] As one Crescentius was called of the Marble Horse, so others were known as de Bonizo, de Roizo, de Duranti, Raynerii, Crescentius Cannulus, Crescentius Stelluto, sub Janiculo, de Polla or Musca Pullo, de Flumine, de Imperio, a Puteo de Proba (of the fountain of Proba), and Squassa Casata (of the ruined house).[3] It is utterly improbable that

[1] *Crescentius qui vocatur Quinque Dentes* (*Gall. d. Prim.*, n. 28, A. 1011): *Adrianus qui caput in collo vocor* (*ibid.*, n. 29, A. 1012). *Benedictus qui supernomen Buccapecu vocatur* (*ibid.*, n. 30, A. 1014). *Johannes Centum Porci* (*ibid.*, n. 259, *A.* 1026). *Leo Curtabraca*, also a *Curtafemora* (*ibid.*, n. 26, 27, A. 1010). The Curtabraca survived until saec. xiv.; in saec. xiii. there was a Torre de' Curtabrachi in the Region Parione (Galletti, *Gabio*, p. 140).

[2] Duret, *Johanns X. Pontificatsantritt*, p. 302, only knows of the two Roman Marozias and one of Ravenna in saec. x. I have read the name, however, in countless tenth century documents of Subiaco and Farfa, and equally often the name of Crescentius.

[3] The copy (attributed to the year 1002) of the spurious donation of Euphemianus (Nerini, p. 33) has the signatures: *Crescentius sub Janiculo., Cresc. de Polla.—Crescent. nob. vir, qui vocor a puteo de Proba*

Crescentius de Theodora.

Crescentius of the Marble Horse was one and the same person with Crescentius de Theodora, as the head of the Roman rebels was now called. The two names are never confused with one another in the *Chronicle of Farfa*. Here Crescentius a Caballo Marmoreo is alone mentioned; the leader of the insurrection against Benedict is, however, elsewhere spoken of as Crescentius de Theodora, and at the time nicknames such as these were very closely adhered to. It is also idle to imagine that in Theodora we discover the notorious Senatrix, and equally idle to suppose that John X. was the father of her son Crescentius. No document gives us any information on the subject. Crescentius belonged, however, to an illustrious patrician family, and was undoubtedly descended from that Crescentius whom we have already noticed among the nobles of Lewis III. His family owned valuable property in the Sabina, and as early as 967 Crescentius is spoken of as Count and Rector of the Sabine territory.[1]

(Vendettini, p. 60; Galletti, *Gabio*, p. 117). The remaining names are scattered through the Farfa documents.

[1] Fatteschi, *Serie*, p. 252: *Crescentius Comes et Rector territor. Sab.* Höfler, p. 300, and Wilmans, *Jahrb.*, ii. 2, 226, give genealogical trees of all the Crescentii, on which, however, hang many strange fruits. If the epitaph in S. Alessio says: *Ex magnis magna proles generatur et alta—Joanne patre, Theodora matre nitescens*: why should these parents be John X. and Theodora Senatrix, when there were so many nobles of the same names? Wilmans overlooked the fact that as early as 901 a Dux Crescentius had appeared, and what is more natural than to see in him the head of the Crescentii? Wilmans makes a certain Stephania, daughter of a Marozia, the great-granddaughter of Crescentius who was executed in 998, and represents her as in the same year (998) wife of Orso de Baro. I know the diploma to which he refers. It says nothing, however, of this relationship. Fragments

Overthrows Benedict VI., and exalts Boniface VII.

Crescentius stirred up an insurrection; the Romans seized Benedict VI., threw him into S. Angelo, and here strangled him in July 974. Meanwhile they raised a deacon, the son of Ferrucius, to S. Peter's Chair as Boniface VII.[1] The Pope thus forcibly installed is said to have been a Roman, but his family is unknown. Since he bore the surname Franco, it has been supposed that he belonged to a family of the name which is frequently mentioned in documents of the tenth century, and which may have been of French origin.[2] Boniface, who stepped to the

of an inscription have been discovered in the crypt of S. Lorenzo, relating to the death of a Landulfus, who had been adopted by the Senatrix Marocia. The father of Landulfus is here specified as a Roman, a descendant of *Senatricis Theodorae atque Johannis consulis et ducis.* In him De Rossi thinks he recognises Crescentius Theodora (*Bull. di Arch. Crist.*, 1864, n. 9). The date of this inscription is *Dep. XV. Kl. Aug. Temp. D. Joh. XII., P. P. Ind. VI., A.D., In DCCCLXIII.* In accordance therewith, De Rossi has boldly brought the Crescentii into connection with Theophylact.

[1] *Cad. Vat.*, 3764: *Comprehensus a quod. Crescentio Theodorae filius et in castellum S. Angeli retrusus ibiq. strangulatus est propter bonifatium diaconi, quem miserunt vivente eo papam.* Amal. Aug.: *de mandato Cencii Theodorae filii, ibi interfectus atque strangulatus. Herm. Contr.*, A. 974: *a Romanis criminatus, et Crescentio Theodorae filio—et eo vivente Bonifacius Ferruccii fil., Pp. ordinatus.* L. Ferrucci wrote *Investigazoni—su la persona ed il pontif. di Bonif. VII., figliuolo di Ferruccio*, 1856, in which he strives to whitewash his blackamoor namesake. Instead of *eo vivente* he invents the reading *ea juvante* (sc. *Theodora*)!—The installation of Boniface and the murder of the Pope probably took place about the same time. Amal. Aug.: *Romani ipsum Bonif. sublimaverunt statim cum dicto Bened. per eos strangulato.*

[2] *Franco de Britto, Franco a S. Eustachio.* The epitaph of Bened. VII. calls Bonif. *Franco.* I have read at Monte Casino diplomas of this period, according to which Ferrucci lived in Gaeta itself; in Nerini, p. 392: A. 1072 *Ferrucius de Johannis de Crescentio testis.* If any one wishes to assert that Boniface VII. was related to Crescentius,

papal throne across the body of the living or dying Benedict, is described as a "monster" by his contemporaries, who assert that he was stained with the blood of his predecessor.[1] The events of this period in Rome are unfortunately only known to us through the most scanty notices, and we are scarcely aware of the elevation of Boniface before we hear of his overthrow. In the course of a month and twelve days he collected the ecclesiastical treasures together and fled to Constantinople, where, like other pretenders, he found protection. This fact makes it probable that his elevation had been associated with the policy of the Greek Emperor, who precisely at this time was striving to supplant German influence in Salerno. The banishment of the anti-pope could only be the work of the German party, which was again triumphant in Rome, and was still headed in the south by the valiant Pandulf the Ironhead.[2]

Boniface driven to Byzantium.

Crescentius also vanishes from history. He does not appear to have sought the Patriciate, and what is more he seems to have remained quietly in Rome after the victory of his opponents. A document of the year 977 mentions Crescentius Illustrissimus, called de Theodora, as a peaceful tenant of a fortress near Velletri.[3] Another document dated October 15,

I have nothing to the contrary. I cannot, however, design genealogical tables.

[1] *Horrendum monstrum Bonif.* (*Malifacius*) *cunctos mortales nequitia superans, etiam prioris Pont. sanguine cruentus.* Thus wrote Gerbert at the Council of Rheims, and Gerbert had been under Otto II., Abbot of Bobbio, and therefore resident in Italy.

[2] *Cod. Vatican. Catal. Eccardi*:—*sed. m.* 1, *d.* 12. *Herm. Contr.*, A. 974: *post unum m. expulsus, Constantinop. postea petiit.*

[3] Lateran document in Galletti's *Vatic. Mscr.*, n. 8042, p. 7: The

989, referring to him as already dead, speaks of him as Consul and Dux, husband of the illustrious Sergia, and father of John and Crescentius.[1] We believe that we finally discover him—and this was in harmony with the spirit of the age—as monk in the convent of S. Alexius, where he remained making expiation for his sins until his death on July 7, 984. An inscription in the church informs us that "Here lies the celebrated Crescentius, the most distinguished Roman citizen, and the great leader. His father John and his mother Theodora bequeathed him renown. Christ, the loving Saviour of souls, laid hold of him, so that, renouncing the world, he cast himself down on the threshold of the holy martyr Boniface, and here, in the habit of a monk, dedicated himself to the Lord. He enriched this temple with gifts and many farms. Pray for him, thou who readest, in order that he may at last obtain forgiveness for his crimes. He died July 7, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord, 984."[2]

Crescentius de Theodora dies as a monk, A. 984.

Abbot John leases the fortress *Crescenzo illmo viro qui appellatur de Theodora*, April 9, 977.

[1] *Vatic. Mscr.*, n. 8043 (pages unnumbered); Lateran documents of Oct. 15, 989: *nos Johannes et Crescentius illmi viri atque germani filii D. Crescentii olim Consulis et Ducis qui dicebatur de Theodora, seu Sergiae illme femine olim jugalium b. m.* Among those who gave their consent there is a Constantia, but no Theodoranda. From this diploma Wilmans (*Excurs. X.*) seeks to prove that the elder Crescentius had really two sons, as specified above.

[2] *Corpore hic recubat Crescentius inclitus ecce,*
Eximius civis Romanus Dux quoque Magnus—
Se DNO tradidit habitum monachorum adeptus—
Hic omnis quicunque legis rogitare memento,
Ut tandem scelerum veniam mereatur habere.
Et obiit d. VII. Mens. Jul. Ann. Domini. Incarn. DCCCCLXXXIV.
C. R. M. jam ante annos duodecim.

3. BENEDICT VII., POPE, 974 — HE PROMOTES THE CLUNIAC REFORM — RESTORES CHURCHES AND CONVENTS — MONASTERY OF SS. BONIFACE AND ALEXIUS ON THE AVENTINE — LEGEND OF S. ALEXIUS — OTTO II.'S ITALIAN EXPEDITION — HIS PRESENCE IN ROME AT EASTER, 981—HIS UNFORTUNATE CAMPAIGN IN CALABRIA — JOHN XIV. BECOMES POPE—DEATH OF OTTO II. IN ROME, DECEMBER 7, 983—HIS TOMB IN ST PETER'S.

The Papal election which followed the flight of Boniface was difficult. Majolus of Cluny, a holy man, declined the tiara offered him by Otto II.; but at length Benedict VII., hitherto Bishop of Sutri, was elected Pope in October, 974. We have no proof that he was the nephew or grandson of Alberic.[1] He condemned Boniface in a council and instituted a vigorous rule, which he succeeded in maintaining for nine

Benedict VII., Pope 974-983.

Papebroch also holds this person to have been the murderer of Benedict. Nerini (p. 84), however, tries to wipe this crime from the tombstone. Explaining C. R. M. as *Cum Regula Monachorum*, he represents Crescentius as a monk as early as 972. But the document of the year 977 shows that he was not a monk at that time. He only became one in 981, when Otto came to Rome. I explain the letters as standing for *Cujus Requies Mors*, and the words as meaning that the epitaph was not placed here until 996, twelve years after his death, when his supposed son was Patricius in Rome. Provana is to blame for having made this Crescentius and his celebrated successor one and the same person.

[1] Leo of Ostia (II. c. 4) calls him *propinquus suprad. Alberici Romanor. consulis*. *Cod. Vat.* 3764 writes *ex patre dd.*, which signifies either *Deus-dedit* or *David*, as the *Catal. Eccardi* has it. According to Jaffé, his ordination took place between the 2nd and 28th Oct. 974. Giesebr., *Jahrb., d. D. R.*, ii. 1, 143.

years, although for more than five Otto remained absent from Italy. The opposing party was, however, repressed by the German faction, in circumstances which remain unknown to us.[1]

The Monastery of S. Boniface and Alexius on the Aventine.

Benedict VII. zealously furthered the reform of Cluny, and provided for the restoration of churches and convents. A stone with rude reliefs, in the courtyard of the convent of S. Scholastica at Subiaco, retains an inscription which tells us that the Pope consecrated the new convent church on December 4, 981.[2] He also restored the new monastery of SS. Boniface and Alexius on the Aventine, which was now the most celebrated monastery in Rome. Although the city had been filled with convents for centuries, none had attained the importance of the abbeys of Italy, Germany, or France. The foundation of Gregory I. on the Coelian had formerly been distinguished as the seminary of the missionaries of England. The venerable abbey of SS. Andrew and Gregory still survived, but various other monasteries had fallen to decay, and we have already spoken of Alberic's care for their restoration. At the end of the tenth century S. Bonifacc on the Aventine revived, and soon became an institution for missionaries to Slavic lands.

[1] Pagi and Sigonius believe that Otto II. had created the Counts of Tusculum, from whom Benedict VII. had sprung. The documents of the time are silent on this subject. Leo, *Gesch. It.*, i. 346, probably misled by this passage in Leo of Ostia, makes a certain Alberic leader in Rome.

[2] *Edificatio ujus* $\overline{Ecle}$ $\overline{Sce}$ *Scolastice Tempore Domni Benedicti VII. PP. Ab Ipso. PPA. Dedicata Q.D.S. An. Ab. Inc. Dm.CCCCCCCCCLXXXI. M.* $\overline{Decb.}$ *D. IIII. Ind. VIII.* (read *IX.*).

The church dedicated to the saint was ancient, legend relating that Euphemianus had given his palace for its erection in the time of the Emperor Honorius. Alexius, son of that senator, was the hero of one of the most beautiful legends of Christian self-renunciation. On the day of his marriage the young nobleman had suddenly forsaken his brilliantly lighted halls and his guests, and instead of embracing his Imperial bride, had addressed a sermon to her on the vanity of all earthly pleasures, and, clad in mean attire, had set forth on a pilgrimage to the remotest deserts. Like Odysseus he returned home a beggar after many years, and, unrecognised, laid himself under the steps of his ancestral palace, where troops of servants passed him by in scorn. Here he lived seventeen years, trodden on and fed like a dog, then died in silence like a hero. The story of his life, written by himself and found in his hand, revealed his identity, and angelic voices testified to his parentage, as also to his greatness. The dead son of the senator was carried from under the steps, and, amid a concourse of Romans of both papal and imperial factions, was buried in S. Peter's.[1] His name was later associated with that of S. Boniface, and although, in the epitaphs of the

Legend of Alexius.

[1] It is questionable whether Alexius was a Roman; his legend being even assigned to Byzantium. *Acta SS.*, 17th July, t. iv. The older Latin Martyrologies and the Martyrol. Roman. (compiled in saec. viii.) are silent concerning him. His legend was very popular in the Middle Ages. Conrad of Würzburg sang of it in his well-known poem; and again, in 1859, Cardinal Wiseman brought S. Alexius from under his wooden staircase on the platform of the stage. The staircase is still seen in S. Alessio, where the festival of the saint is celebrated on the 17th of July.

time of Benedict VII., Boniface stands alone, the two saints are mentioned together at the end of the tenth century. Probably alongside the ancient church, which was a diaconate, a convent already stood. Both had fallen to decay when Benedict consigned them to the care of Sergius, the Greek Metropolitan, in 977. Sergius, flying before the Arabs, had forsaken his bishopric, that of Damascus, and had come as a fugitive to Rome. Here he founded the monastery of S. Boniface, and became its first abbot. Although the convent acknowledged the Benedictine rule, followers of Basil dwelt within it side by side with the Latins, and the fact that the monastery had been a Greek colony had undoubtedly determined Sergius's choice. The surrounding district was called Blachernae; S. Boniface himself had met his death at Tarsus; and Euphemianus, his wife Aglae, and her son Alexius were Greeks, as their names inform us. Here Sergius of Damascus lived until 981, when Leo succeeded him as abbot, and the new monastery soon became the centre of a distinguished band, of whom we shall later have to speak.[1]

Benedict VII. meanwhile could abandon himself in peace to his care for cloistral discipline. Did we possess more definite information concerning the time, we should doubtless find him engaged in conflict with his opponents, perhaps even flying before them. With the other motives which led to Otto II.'s expedition to Rome, was associated an urgent summons from the Pope, praying for deliverance from the hands

[1] I have already spoken of Nerini's important work on this monastery. For Sergius's epitaph, see p. 68.

of his oppressors.[1] Since the fall of Berengar and his sons, and since the most influential bishoprics and counties in northern Italy had been filled with followers of the house of Saxony, Southern Italy alone offered a stage for the young Emperor's thirst for adventure. Rome and Italy still trembled before the Saracens. The Arab fortress at Fraxinetum had, it is true, been destroyed by William of Provence in 972, but from Sicily the infidels still continued their raids on Calabria. It was further necessary to fight the Greeks, who strove to recover Capua and Benevento; it was also necessary to bring Apulia under the rule of the German sceptre and to conquer Sicily. Burning to accomplish deeds such as these, Otto II. came to Italy in the autumn of 980. He celebrated Christmas in Ravenna, where it is possible that he met the Pope; but not until Easter 981 did he arrive in Rome. He was accompanied by his mother Adelaide, his wife Theophano, his sister Matilda, abbess of Quedlinburg, Duke Hugh Capet of France, King Conrad of Burgundy, and several other princes and nobles.[2] Otto II. in Rome, 981.

No contemporary annalist relates that Otto punished the rebels of 974. Later informants, however, have invented a tale which recounts how, after the manner

[1] *Annal. Coloniens.* (*Mon. Germ.*, i. 98), *ad. A.* 981 : *apostolicus in sed. receptus est*, as if Otto had brought him back. Richer (*Hist.* iii. c. 81) merely says that the Emperor had come to Rome: *repressurus etiam si qui forte essent tumultus.*

[2] *Annal. Saxo.* A. 981, *Chron. Casaur.* A. 981, and *Chron. Farf.* p. 478, produce the well-known diploma of Otto II. : *dat.* 14, *Kal. Maji. Actum Romae in Palatio juxta Eccl. b. Petri Ap.* and *Actum Romae* 3, *Non. Maji.*

of Caracalla, the Emperor gave a banquet beside the steps of S. Peter's, and how during the repast he caused some of the guests to be beheaded, while the rest of the company remained at table: a stupid legend, which is still occasionally repeated by Italian historians.[1] The young Emperor, before whose wrath Crescentius had sought refuge in the cowl, left Rome in June or July for Southern Italy. Here the Greeks (the brothers of Theophano, Basil II., and Constantine IX. now ruled in Byzantium), and the Saracens, under Abul Kasem of Palermo, were arming themselves for his reception. The struggle of Otto in the provinces, where the empires of East and West and the power of Islam had so long been at strife, was unsuccessful. After the battle, first won and then lost, at Stilo, on July 13, 982, where the flower of the German and Italian nobility fell under the sabres of the Saracen, and after his adventurous rescue from the Greek vessel, which had carried the fugitive to Rossano, Otto returned to Capua.[2] His plans were

His defeat at Stilo, July 13.

[1] It is derived from the Pantheon of Gotfried, after whom Ricobald, *Hist. Imp.*, repeats it. Muratori blames Sigonius for having accepted this fable; still more deserving of censure are the most modern Italians Ferrucci and Amarí, the latter of whom, on the strength of the myth is pleased to call Otto *Sanguinarius*. Concerning the legend, see Giesebrecht's *Excursus XIII.*

[2] Amari (*Storia dei Musulm*, ii. 324) shows the harmony existing between Thietmar and Ibn-el-Athîr. Four thousand Germans fell, and Abul-Kasem on the side of the Saracens. Amari's thanks to Otto for his endeavour to free Italy from these brigands takes the shape of delight that the Emperor died "*di rabbia.*" With him the Saracens become Guelfs, the battle of Stilo a *prima Legnano*. I regret this in an author whom I respect. How high Murratori stands above all party prejudice!

shattered; the Byzantines triumphed; and had they been able to avail themselves of the great victory of Islam, the Greek Emperor might perhaps have established his exarchs in Ravenna, his Popes in Rome. Filled with dismay, the nobles of the Empire surrounded Otto in Verona in June 983. The child Otto (III.) was here elected king of Germany and Italy, and the Emperor hastened back to Southern Italy to undertake a fresh campaign. He went to Rome, where the death of Benedict VII., in September or October 983, rendered his presence necessary.[1]

John XIV., Pope, 983–984.

The Emperor caused Peter of Pavia, Imperial Chancellor, to be elected as John XIV., but scarcely had the election taken place when the Emperor fell dangerously ill. The exertions of the last few years had exhausted a constitution that was not formed of steel like his father's. His friends and companions gathered round the deathbed of the young Emperor. He bequeathed his wealth to the Church and the poor, to his mother Adelaide, his only sister Matilda, and lastly to the soldiers who out of love to him had left their native country. He confessed to the Pope in presence of the bishops and cardinals, received

[1] His epitaph is still preserved in S. Croce: *D. X. M. Jul. in Apost. sede residens IX. ann. abiit ad Christum Ind. XII.* Ind. XII. began in Sept. 983; July, perhaps, has only to be altered to October. Baron. gives the inscription from S. Cosmo and Damian with the date, *Joann. XIV. Papa m. Febr. d.* 22, *Ind. XII. A.* 984, which correct chronology he then changes into A. 985 and *Ind. XIII.* Jaffé and Giesebrecht seek to prove that Benedict died in Oct. 983. His epitaph, which is modelled on that of Stephen VI., says:

Hic primus repulit Franconi spurca superbi,
Culmina qui invasit sedis apostolicae,
Qui dominum suum captum in castro habebat.

Death of Otto II., Dec. 7, 983.

absolution, and died in his eight and twentieth year, in the Imperial palace beside S. Peter's, on December 7, 983.[1]

The only Emperor of German race who died and was buried in Rome received a grave in the eastern side of the *paradiso* of S. Peter's, to the left of the entrance. His remains were laid in an ancient coffin, on which was sculptured the likeness of a consul and his wife. Ancient coffins changed hands in Rome as well as the columns of beauteous temples, and as living Emperors of German race disguised themselves under the titles and forms of antiquity, so the dead were laid to rest in the sarcophagi of bygone times. A mosaic representing the Saviour in the act of blessing, and standing between SS. Peter and Paul, was placed above Otto's grave. This remarkable picture, now built into the wall of the Vatican crypt, remains a monument of the art of the period. The execution, although bad, is better than that of the time of John VII. The character of Christ's head, with its long black hair, is dignified, but the drawing and light and shade are both defective, especially in the case of the two apostles, where Peter carries a bunch of three keys. The mosaic was doubtlessly executed by order of Theophano, and was placed by her over the pagan coffin which contained the remains of her husband. Through a course of seven

His grave in S. Peter's.

[1] *Chronagr. Saxo*, A. 983. He alone speaks of the appointment of John XIV. by Otto. Richer, III. c. 96 relates, that Otto succumbed to dysentery after having swallowed four drachms of aloes. Siegbert, *Chron.: taedio et angore animi deficiens Romae moritur.* His character is well drawn in the *Vita Adalberti*, c. 8, and still better by Thietmar, III. 1.

centuries, the German pilgrim was able reverently to gaze on the Imperial tomb until it was destroyed in the course of the rebuilding of the basilica in the time of Paul V. The body of the Emperor was then taken from the sarcophagus in the presence of a notary, who confirmed the statements as to Otto's shortness of stature. The Imperial remains were begrudged the ancient urn in which they had reposed; the coffin was sacrilegiously made over to the cooks of the Quirinal to serve as a common cistern, and the ashes of the Emperor were laid in another marble sarcophagus arched over with stucco. The grave where Otto II. sleeps, near his relation Gregory V., may still be seen in the crypt of the Vatican. As he wanders amid the twilight of these wondrous catacombs, and surveys the tragic company of popes resting side by side like mummies in their sarcophagi, the traveller cannot remain unmoved by the sadness of history.[1]

[1] An illustration of the mosaic and of the present monument is given in Dinoysius, *Sacrar. Basil. Vat. Cryptar. Mon. Tab.* X. and XLV. See also Torrigius, *Le Sacre Grotte*, p. 364. Bonizo deems Otto II. fortunate: *tergue quaterque beatus, qui ex tanto numero Imperatorum et Regum solus meruit inter Pontifices cum apostolor. Principe consortium habere sepulturae* (Oefele, *Rer. Boicar.* II. lib. 4, 93, 800). His epitaph by Gerbert in *Duschesne Hist. Franc.*, 807:—CVIVS AD. IMPERIVM TREMVERE. DVCES TVLIT. HOSTIS. QVEM DOMINVM. POPVLIQVE. SVVM. NOVERE. PARENTEM. OTTO DECVS DIVVM. CAESAR. CHARISSIME. NOBIS. IMMERITIS RAPVIT. TE. LVX. SEPTENA DECEMBRIS.

4. Ferrucius Returns to Rome—Terrible End of John XIV.—Boniface's Reign of Terror—His Overthrow—John XV., Pope, 985—Crescentius seizes the Patrician Power—Theophano comes to Rome as Regent of the Empire—She Tranquillises the City—S. Adalbert in Rome.

Standing beside Otto's coffin, John XIV. was able to foresee his own speedy overthrow. The Romans now felt themselves free from the dreaded Emperor. His heir, a crowned child of three, under the guardianship of a woman, was menaced by the arms of an ambitious relation, Henry of Bavaria, who had assumed the regal title in Germany. Theophano had therefore left the city in the spring of 984. The desire for a Roman Pope became general, and the still living pretender appeared in Rome at a highly favourable moment.

For more than nine years the son of Ferrucius had lived in exile at Byzantium, his thoughts ever fixed on the throne in S. Peter's. He had joined the league of Greeks and Saracens, had heard with satisfaction of the defeat, with joy of the death of the Emperor. He now came to Rome. He found the Chair of Peter occupied by the Bishop of Pavia; but his followers rallied round him, and his treasury or the gold of the Greek acquired him new friends. Boniface had been dismissed with best wishes from Constantinople; he was accompanied by Greeks, and a treaty had probably been made between him and

Boniface VII. returns to Rome.

the Byzantine Court. The lack of documents, however, leaves us in ignorance concerning this transaction, and the history of Rome appears more than ever confused.

The overthrow of John XIV. was sudden and terrible. After having fallen into the hands of Ferrucius he languished for four months in the dungeons of S. Angelo, and at last fell a victim either to starvation or poison.[1] The revolution must have taken place about Easter 984, and the death of John have followed in the summer. Boniface, who had caused a synod to depose John as a usurper, never ceased to regard himself as lawful Pope, and after his return reckoned his reign as dating from the year 974.[2] Boniface must therefore have filled the papal chair for eleven months, but of this period of history we remain in utter ignorance. The casual mention of the fact that he had caused Cardinal John's eyes to be torn out, gives us reason to suppose that other

Fall of John XIV., 984.

[1] *Catal. Eccardi: quem Bonif. reversus a Constant.—comprehensum in Castello s. Ang.—per 4 m. inedia attritum jussit occidi. Cod. Vat.* 3764, and, in agreement therewith, 1437:—*Quem iste supranomin. Bonif. Ferrucii filius reversus a Const.—comprehendit ac deposuit et in castello s. angeli in custodia misit—ibiq. infirmitatem et famis inopiam per IV. m. sustinuit ac mortuus est et ut fertur occisus est. Cod. Vat.* 1304: *qui bonefacius révers. a Const. dans pecuniam interfecit predictum petrum. Herm. Aug. Chron.* adds: *et, ut perhibent, toxicavit.* This catalogue and *Chron. Bernoldi* give John XIV. eight months; the *Chron. Vultur.* alone has nine months (wrongly *annos*), and registers his starvation in *Ind. XII.* A. 984. Baron. somewhere found the epitaph, which gives Aug. 20.—Gerbert, *Acta Concil. Rem.*

[2] Ferrucci produces some documents which reckon the X., XI., even XII. year of Boniface VII., in the Ind. XIII., from which we see how untrustworthy these dates are.

atrocities were probably committed in the desire for revenge fostered by his long exile. He himself had become a stranger to the Romans, and his sudden death shows that he had grown inconvenient to his own followers. This faction was not so much Byzantine as national-Roman; the party which had formerly been under the leadership of Crescentius, and was now headed by his sons. They overthrew the papal tyrant, hoping themselves to seize the government of the city in the present favourable conditions.

Fall of Boniface VII., 985.

Boniface VII. undoubtedly suffered a violent death. His remains, exposed to the insults of the populace, were dragged through the streets, and at length thrown aside under the statue of Marcus Aurelias. Thus repeatedly was this statue, the monument of one of the noblest Emperors of Rome, used as a sort of scaffold in times of revolution. The following morning, servants of the palace removed the corpse and gave it Christian burial. And after a reign of eleven years, during which he had overthrown two popes, and allowed them to perish in S. Angelo, Boniface VII. ended his career in the summer of 985.[1]

John XV., Pope, 985–996.

John XV. succeeded to S. Peter's Chair in circumstances unknown to us. He belonged to the quarter

[1] *Cod. Vat.* 1340: *veneno interiit. Cod.* 3764 and 1437: *repentina morte interiit*, and they relate the story given in the text. From them *Herm. Augien. ad.* A. 985 borrowed. *Catal. Eccardi* agrees therewith. Boniface was still living in May 985. *Pont D. Bonifacii, S. P. et univers. VII. Pape in Sacr. Sede B. P. Ap. A. XI. Ind. XIII. m. Madio die III.* (Galletti, *Mscr. Vat.* 8048, p. 25). After 984 he caused a Denarius to be struck: OTTO IMPE. ROM.; on the other side, SCS PEV BONIF; in the middle, PAPAE. See *Promis.*

Gallina Alba, described by the Notitia as situated in the Sixth Region, Alta Semita.[1] He was the son of the Presbyter Leo, and his family, which is unknown, must have been hostile to the house of Crescentius and friendly towards the German or Imperial party. John must therefore have been raised to the throne by the German, in opposition to the national faction. He was accounted learned, and is supposed to have been the author of various books. The ignorance of the Roman clergy must, therefore, all the more have offended him; and since he sought to fill all the most influential posts with his partisans and relations, he was in return hated by the clergy.[2] The temporal power had, however, been seized since the return or death of Boniface by John Crescentius, probably the son of the first Crescentius. This celebrated Roman, called Numentanus by later chroniclers —probably from the fact that he was possessor of the Sabine Numentum, now Mentana—strove to re-

[1] Jaffé shows that he was consecrated between Aug. 6 and Oct. 16, 985. In documents of S. Cyriacus et Nicol. in *via lata* (Galletti, 8048), I find also the following dates: A. 988, *Joh. XV. P. A. III. m. madio Ind. I.* A. 988, *Joh. XV. P.A. III. Ind. I. m. Octobrio d. V.* A. 989. *Joh. XV. P. A. IV. Ind. II. m. Febr. d. VI.* Recent investigations have done away with another John, whose reign of from 4 to 6 months had been inserted between those of Boniface VII. and John XV. (*Cod. Vat.* 1340; Ptol. of Lucca, Amalr. Augr.). Willmans *Jahrb.*, p. 208, 212; Jaffé, p. 486. The catalogues give John XV. *a X. m.* 7. *d.* 10.

[2] *Iste exosos habuit clericos, propter quod et Clerici eum odio habuerunt; et merito quia quae habere poterat, parentibus distribuebat. Chron. Farf.* 644; of which the source is *Cod. Vat.* 1437 and 3765. The nephew of this Pope appears as Dux of Aricia *A.* 990; *Guido vir nob. neptus Pontificis et Dux Ariciensis*, Murat., *Antich. Dissert. V.* Guido may have belonged to the house of the Tusculans, which was hostile to the Crescentii.

store the authority of Alberic, and for some years succeeded in making himself ruler in Rome. We find him as head of the national party, although not invested with the title of Princeps and Senator of all the Romans. No document at least speaks of him by these titles. In 985, however, he adopted the dignity of Patricius.[1] This he might safely do, since there was no Emperor at the time. He thereby gave it to be understood that he was the representative of the Roman Senate and people, and possessed the temporal power in the city, although not regarding himself as an independent prince. Italy made no further effort to regain her national independence. She put forward no native king, no foreign prince. The Counts held the balance of power between the bishoprics, which, having grown powerful under Guido and Lambert, and still more powerful through the privileges accorded to them by both the Ottos, had now become almost states within the state. They remained favourable to the Empire, while not a single man possessed of adventurous spirit seemed forth-

Crescentius Patricius, 985.

[1] The *Vita Joh. XVI.* (XV.) in Muratori calls him *Patricius urbis Romae: Romuald. Salernit.* Murat., vii. 165: *Romani Capitainei Patriciatus sibi tyrannidem vendicavere*, which is word for word said by Bonizo, who likewise adds: *a Crescentio Numentano, qui Patricius dicebatur.* A document in *Gattula Accession.*, i. 115, thus expresses itself: *anno Deo propicio pont. D. Joannis s. pont. et univer. pape—Ind. XIV. m. Jan. d. 3. Imperante a. primo Dom. Johanne Crescentione filio Romanor. Patricio.* The phrase *Imperante-Patricio* denotes the Vicariate in the Emperor's stead; the diploma contains the donation of a fishery at Terracina to the Monastery of S. Stephen. That the title of Patricius appears in Rome earlier than 1010 is shown by Mittarelli, I. Ap. 41, p. 97, a document of the year 975, which is signed *Benedictus patritius a Stefanus rogatus.*

coming from among the nobles. After the death of Otto II., Italy, in continuing to respect the rights of a Saxon child and to fix her eyes on Germany, condemned herself anew to foreign servitude, while it was inevitable that Germany, by reason of her political power, should rule the divided country.

The attitude of the Romans alone caused anxiety to the regent Theophano. She therefore hastened her return to the city, summoned thither by the distracted Pope. On her arrival in 989, the usually restless Italy yielded obedience to the Greek, whose two brothers meanwhile, by a curious coincidence, ruled the Empire of the East. The gates of the city were not closed against her by the Patricius; she met with no resistance from the Romans, who instead yielded obedience to the mother of the young prince who was to wear the Imperial crown. This attitude of submission is not satisfactorily explained by the assumption that the German faction was very strong at the time; it can only have been the result of a treaty which Theophano had already concluded with Crescentius. She did not admit that the Imperium had been extinguished by the death of her husband, but rather regarded the Sovereignty over Rome as the hereditary right of her son. The Imperial government of a woman was unprecedented in the West. Theophano, however — a Byzantine — recalled the examples of Irene and Theodora, and exercised as Imperatrix, nay, actually as "Imperator," full Imperial power both in Ravenna and Rome. She held Placita in person, and judicial decisions were ratified in

Theophanô comes to Rome.

her name.[1] We may conclude that she made the Romans swear to acknowledge her son and all stipulated Imperial rights, and that in these conditions she confirmed Crescentius in the Patriciate.

She celebrated Christmas in Rome, and left the city in the spring of 990. She honoured the memory of her husband by alms and masses, and the exhortation of a saint somewhat assuaged her grief.[2] Adalbert, Bishop of Prague, a pious enthusiast, and a man destined later to exercise immense influence on her son, was in Rome at this time. In Adalbert the restless nature of the Slav was united with the fervour of a Roman saint of old. Christianity had but lately reached the Slavs, and Adalbert was the second Bishop of Prague. Condemned to live among the Bohemians, he was repelled by their barbarism, and instead of exerting himself in the work of their civilisation, he set the law at defiance, and left his bishopric to make a pilgrimage first to Rome and then to Jerusalem. Theophano gave him money for his journey; he

Adalbert of Prague.

[1] *Annal. Hildesh.*, A. 989 (*M. Germ.*, v. 68) : *Theophanu Imperatrix mater Regis Romam perrexit, ibiq. Natale domini celebravit et omnem regionem Regi subdidit.* In the *Reg. Farf.*, n. 436, we find the sufficiently ridiculous phrase : *Theophanius gratia divina Imperator Augustus ;* and *Imperii domni Theophanii Imperatoris XVIII.* The Ravennese documents of I. Ap. 990 has : *Imperii Domnae Theophanu Imperatricis XVIII. Ind. III. actum Ravennae feliciter*, where the Imperium was consequently reckoned from her marriage with Otto II. Other documents : *Chron. Vulturn*, Murat., i. p. 2, 484, of the 4 *Non. Jan.*, 990. *Actum Rome ; Theophanu divina gr. Imperatrix Augusta.* Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.*, iv. 69.

[2] *Erat autem ipsis diebus Romae imperatrix augusta Theophanu*, &c., *Vita S. Adalb.*, *Mon. Germ.*, vi. c. 13, 14, and Bruno's *Vita S. Adalb.*, c. 12, *ibid.*

accepted it, and gave it to the poor. He wandered first to Monte Casino, and then sought the most celebrated saint of Calabria. This Greek hermit bore the mystic name of Nilus. He lived like an errant patriarch with his disciples in Southern Italy, through the provinces of which he wandered, revered and adored by princes and people, working miracles and preaching the gospel of peace. The venerable saint forbade Adalbert's further journey to Jerusalem, but on the contrary sent him to Leo, Abbot of S. Boniface, in Rome. Here the Slavic bishop took the cowl at Easter 990, and remained some years in the monastery. Leo Simplex was now Abbot, and not only Leo but several of the monks—for instance, John the Wise, Theodosius the Silent, John the Innocent, and even followers of the order of S. Basil—were renowned for their virtues, silent or eloquent. While the city re-echoed with the strife of parties, these holy men lived amid the ruins of the Aventine, within sight of the Pyramid of Cestius and of Monte Testaccio, and formed enthusiastic schemes for the conversion of heathen lands, or for shedding their blood in Christ's service. In his ambition Crescentius aspired to the glory of an ancient Roman hero; Adalbert longed to attain the fame of a Roman martyr. The bishop was obliged, however, to leave the tranquil cloister. The Archbishop of Mainz required his return, and a Roman synod commanded him to depart for Prague. No sooner had he reached his home, and convinced himself of the futility of his efforts, than he quitted Prague for the second time in 995, and again appeared at the Convent of S. Boniface.

S. Nilus.

CHAPTER V.

1. Deeper decadence of the Papacy—Invective of the Gallic Bishops against Rome—Hostile attitude of the Provincial Synods—Crescentius usurps the Temporal Power—Flight of John XV.—His return to Rome—His Death, 996—Gregory V. the first German Pope—Subjection of the Papacy to the German Empire—Otto III., Emperor, May 21, 996.

THE Papacy now seemed to have reached the utmost limit of its degradation. Not in Rome alone, but elsewhere, reverence for the Chair of Peter had been extinguished by the criminals who had filled it. The celebrated synod of Rheims, of the year 991, affords a striking proof of our assertion. Arnulf, Archbishop of this city, the first metropolis of France, had treacherously surrendered it into the power of his uncle Charles, Duke of Lorraine, and, at the instance of Hugh Capet, the usurper of the Carolingian throne, had been handed over for trial to an assembly of bishops. On the demand of a priest that the question should be referred to the supreme authority, the Pope, Arnulf, Bishop of Orleans, rose and spoke as follows: —"O unfortunate Rome, in the silence of the past thou gavest our ancestors the light of the Fathers of the Church. Our times, however, thou hast darkened

Invective of the Bishop of Orleans against the Papacy of the time.

with a night so terrible as shall make them notorious even in the future. Once thou gavest us the renowned Leos, the great Gregories. What shall I say of Gelasius or of Innocent, who surpassed all the philosophers of the universe in wisdom and in eloquence? What have we not witnessed in these days? We have seen John, who bore the surname of Octavian, wallowing in the mire of sensuality, and even conspiring against Otto, whom he himself had crowned. John was banished, and Leo, a neophyte, made Pope. The Emperor Otto left Rome; Octavian returned, banished Leo, deprived John the Deacon of his nose, the fingers of his right hand, and his tongue; in his passionate fury he executed several of the nobles, and soon after himself died. The Romans elected the grammarian Benedict in his place. The neophyte Leo with his Emperor soon after seized Benedict, deposed and banished him into life-long exile in Germany. Emperor Otto was succeeded by Emperor Otto, who excelled all princes of our times in arms, in wisdom, and in knowledge. A dreadful monster, however, dripping with the blood of his predecessor, filled the Chair of Peter: Boniface, a man who in criminality surpassed the rest of mankind. Banished and condemned by a synod, he returned to Rome after Otto's death. In spite of his oath he hurled Pope Peter, formerly Bishop of Pavia, from the highest position in the city, and after deposing his victim and subjecting him to frightful torture in prison, finally murdered him. Where is it written that the innumerable company of priests of God, scattered over the earth, and adorned by learning and merit, should be subject to

monsters devoid of all knowledge, human and divine, and a disgrace to the world?" The bold speaker then asked the assembled bishops, who in terror or satisfaction had listened to his unprecedented discourse, by what name the Pope who sat in vestments of gold and purple on S. Peter's Chair was to be called. "If," he said, "he has not charity and is not filled with learning, then is he anti-Christ, who, enthroned in the temple of God, like a god, attracts the regard of mankind. If he lack Christian charity as well as learning, he is an idol in God's temple, from whom we may as well expect oracles as from a block of marble." The speaker further insisted that there were many enlightened bishops in Belgium and Germany to whose decision the affairs of Rheims might be submitted, instead of making appeal to the spiritual forum of a city where everything was venal, and where judgment was measured according to the weight of gold.[1]

This was the Catilinarian oration pronounced against the Papacy of the tenth century. But so firmly was the great institution based on the needs of mankind that it remained proof against conditions of dissolution which would have sufficed to shatter king-

[1] *Quid hunc—in sublimi solio residentem, veste purpurea et aurea radiantem, quid hunc, inquam, esse censetis? Nimirum si caritate destituitur, solaque scientia inflatur et extollitur, Antichristus est, in templo Dei sedens, et se ostendens tamquam sit Deus. Si autem nec caritate fundatur, nec scientia erigitur, in Templo Dei tamquam statua, tamquam idolum est, a quo responsa petere, marmora consulere est.* That everything in Rome was corrupt was the universal opinion of contemporaries. The Abbot Abbo of Fleury found John XV. *turpis lucri cupidum, atque in omnibus suis actibus venalem.*—Aimon, *Vitae S. Abbonis*; Muratori, *Annal.* A. 996.

doms. To its inner enemies,—the decay of Church discipline, the overbearing nobility within the city, the Imperial dominion,—were united the provincial synods also. Since the time of the Carolingians the bishops had become almost independent princes within their privileged territories; the state lay in their hands, they as the chief nobles of the Empire directing political affairs, and in culture and in diplomatic skill far surpassing all temporal barons. At this period the Episcopate struggled with formidable weapons against the Papacy. The victory of the synods, yea, the separation of the Gallic Church had become possible. Meanwhile we shall hear how Rome answered the charge of Rheims, and shall again find bishops, princes and kings prostrate at the feet of the dishonoured Papacy.

Crescentius rules in Rome.

The later years of John XV. were stormy. The Pope was hated by the Romans on account of his nepotism and his avarice. We may therefore assume that after the departure of Theophano, and still more after her death, which soon followed (June 15, 991), Crescentius took the government of the city entirely into his hands. After the second synod of Rheims in 995, the Frankish bishops complained that their envoys and those of King Hugh had not met with a fitting reception from John XV., because, as they believed, they had brought no presents to Crescentius. The envoys asserted that no one obtained a hearing in Rome unless the "tyrant," for the sake of gold, condescended to acquit or condemn him.[1] John was

[1] *Mon. Germ.*, v. 691, 693: *neminem in judiciis attingere fas est,*

He banishes John XV., 995.

actually obliged to fly to the Margrave Hugo in Tuscany in 995. Hugo belonged to the German party, and John sent a summons imploring the boyish Otto to undertake an expedition to Rome. The news of Otto's approach induced the rebellious Romans to recall the Pope. They accorded him an honourable reception and made their peace.[1] John, however, did not see the arrival of his deliverer, dying in March or April 996.[2]

Roman Expedition of Otto III. 996.

The youthful Otto left Regensburg and crossed the Alps by the Brenner in the spring of that year. He came at the head of a great military force and with a retinue of several bishops and nobles, among whom was Willigis of Mainz, the true leader of the expedition. He celebrated Easter at Pavia, where he first heard of John's death. At Ravenna Roman envoys brought him letters from the nobility, assuring him that the Romans looked forward to his arrival, that the death of the Pope had placed them in a difficulty,

nisi quem Crescentius tirannus mercede conductus voluerit absolvere, vel punire.

[1] Baronius assumes 985 to have been the year of John's flight; Muratori records it with doubt in 987. To me 995 seems the right date. The Catalogues of the Popes are now silent. *Amalr. Auger.: propter persecut. Patricii Urbis Romae et Senatus, ipsum oportuit ab ipsa Urbe recedere. Sed postmod. prae timore Ottonis Imp. ipsum miserunt quaesitum.*—Similarly *Jordani Chron.* (Murat., *Ant. It.* iv. 957).

[2] The questionable epitaph of John XV., in Baronius, A. 996, registers the death on May 7. Jaffé assumes the date to have been in the beginning of April, since it was at Easter (April 12) that Otto III. received the news of John's death at Pavia (*Chron. Venetum*, *Mon. Germ.*, vii. 30). Marini, *Papiri*, n. 36, has a diploma of John XV. of the year 992, wherein the Bishop of Portus is granted a piece of ground for a fish-pond. The Lacus Trajanus is mentioned here; the harbour had become a marshy lake.

and that they therefore awaited his wishes concerning the new election.[1] This submissive attitude was due to fear, for Crescentius possessed neither the power nor the genius of Alberic. During the short time that he ruled his native city (in less favourable circumstances, it is true, than those of Alberic), he appears solely as the head of a faction, never as a prince.[2] The Patricius was forced to respect in the grandson of Otto I. the rights usurped by his ancestor with regard to the Papal election; and while still a boy Otto III. arbitrarily disposed of the tiara, after his grandfather had received the Imperial crown from the hands of a boyish Pope.

He awarded the Papacy to his cousin and chaplain Bruno, a son of the Margrave Otto of Verona, Duke of Carinthia, and through his grandmother, Liutgarda, a great-grandson of Otto I.[3] Bruno was only twenty-

[1] *Vita S. Adalberti*, c. 21: *Ibi in ejus occursum veniunt epistolae cum nunciis, quas mittunt Romani proceres et senatorius ordo.* We hear no longer of *clerus*, *ordo*, and *populus*; the nobility had seized the entire power. Concerning Otto's Roman expedition, see Giesebrecht, I.

[2] No Papal coins of his time have been preserved. After the coins of Benedict VII. (OTTO IMPE ROM), we possess no Papal denarii for the space of 150 years, some of Leo IX. (1049–1055) and of Paschalis II. (1099–1118) excepted. The coins of the Calabrian John (XVI.) in Cinagli are to be rejected; and that in Maffei (*Verona Illustr.* iii. 271), where Crescentius is designated as IMP. AUG. P.P., and is represented on horseback addressing the army, is an absurdity of the 17th century, as the drawing in the style of Domenichino is enough to prove.

[3] Conrad, son of Werinher, in 943 Duke of Lorraine, married Luitgarda, daughter of Otto I., and died like a hero at Lechfeld, A. 955. In 978, his son Otto was invested with the Dukedom of Carinthia, and also the Margravate of Verona.—A. Otto, *Papst Gregor V.*, Münster, 1881.

three or twenty-four years of age, had received a good secular education, and was possessed of distinguished abilities; but he was of a passionate and headstrong disposition. With the consent of the German and Italian nobility, who surrounded him in Ravenna, Otto sent the Pope-designate, escorted by Willigis of Mainz and Hildebald of Worms, to Rome, where he was received with honour. A so-called election saved appearances, and the first Pope of purely German descent ascended the papal throne as Gregory V. on May 3, 996.[1] The frightful conditions in which Rome now found herself proved that she could no longer furnish a fitting candidate for the papal chair. The friends of the Papacy in Italy, Germany and France therefore hailed the election of Bruno as an unexpected stroke of good fortune; the order of Cluny rejoiced at the accession of their friend, and hopes were universally cherished that a Pope of the Imperial line might effect the reform of the degenerate Church. Only the Romans murmured. The Apostolic Chair had fallen into the hands of the Saxon house—a triumph of the Imperial power, which threw everything else, even the victories of Otto the Great, into the shade.

Gregory V. the first German Pope, 996–999.

The elevation of the German Bruno thus put an end to the reprehensible custom, which had silently become law, that none but a Roman should be elected to the Papal Chair. In the course of the two hundred and fifty years which had elapsed since the reign of the Syrian Zacharias, out of the forty-seven bishops

[1] Pagi already recognised that Gregory V. must have been consecrated at the beginning of May; Mansi, in the *Note to Baronius*, A. 996, p. 349, assumes, with great probability, the date May 3.

who had filled it, all but two had been either Romans or natives of the State of the Church. Of these one, Boniface VI., was a Tuscan; the other, John XIV., a native of Pavia. The national feeling of the Romans must therefore have sustained a deadly wound. Rather would they have seen a monster of Roman birth seated on the sacred chair than a saint of Saxon origin. Meanwhile the Papacy assumed wider relations under Gregory V. It became independent of the local barriers of the city and the civic aristocracy, and was again placed in a universal relation to the world. The great principle that the nationality of the Pope is a matter of indifference, had its origin in the idea of Christianity, in which the conception of the nation is lost in the conception of mankind. It was, moreover, in perfect harmony with the cosmopolitan idea of the head of the universal Church, and to it the Papacy owed in part its temporal dominion. Although the principle was in no way expressed as a law by the elevation of Bruno or after him, nevertheless since the great universal forces were more powerful than the voices of the Romans, who incessantly demanded a Roman Pope, the realisation of this principle followed after some interruption as a natural result. Throughout the entire Middle Ages Romans, Italians, Germans, Greeks, Frenchmen, Englishmen, Spaniards rose to the Apostolic Chair, until with the end of universal papal dominion, the principle died out, and the custom that none but an Italian should sit on the papal throne again silently became law, and clearly showed the narrowed confines of the Papacy.

Otto III. crowned as Emperor by Gregory V., May 21, 996.

After the installation of his cousin, Otto came to Rome to take the Imperial crown from the hands of the Pope of his own creation. He was received with great solemnity, and was crowned in S. Peter's on May 21; and with the coronation ended the authority of Crescentius as Patricius. After the Imperial title had been in abeyance for thirteen years, Rome again saw a new Augustus within her walls, and with him a new Pope.[1] The former aimed at the restoration of the Empire of Charles, if not that of Trajan, and by his side the Pope desired, like another Gregory, to establish the universal power of the Papacy—aims essentially at variance with one another. These German youths, both as yet but boys, one twenty-four, the other only fifteen years of age, related to one another, and standing together on the utmost pinnacles of power to which mortal could attain, presented a singular spectacle in Rome. The Romans doubtless looked with indignation on the fair-haired Saxons who had come to rule their city and with it Christendom, and foreigners so inexperienced can hardly have inspired reverence. Did the Emperor and Pope ever find themselves alone together in the chambers of the Lateran, they may probably have sworn eternal friendship, and formed visionary schemes for universal dominion or for the benefit of the human race. The world, however, offers problems beyond the grasp of enthusiastic boys. The

[1] The author of the *Vita S. Adalb.* therefore exclaims: *Laetantur cum primatibus minores civitatis: cum afflicto paupere exultant agmina viduarum, quia novus imperator dat jura populo, dat jura novus papa.* c. 21.

dream begotten of Roman inspiration scarcely lasted four months. In three years the young Pope, in six the young Emperor, was no more.[1]

2. Condemnation of the Roman Rebels—Crescentius is Pardoned—Adalbert obliged to leave Rome—His Martyrdom—Otto III. leaves Rome—Rebellion of the Romans—Revolt of the City against Papacy and Empire—Crescentius drives Gregory V. out of the City—Revolution in Rome—Crescentius raises John XVI. to the Papal chair.

On May 25, 996, Otto and Gregory assembled in S. Peter's a Council of the two nations, which, like earlier Councils, assumed the character of a Court of Justice. Now that a member of the Imperial family had been raised to the Papacy, it was necessary that,

[1] Dümmler, *Auxil. und Vulgar.*, p. 57, gives from a Bamberg MS. a remarkable poem on the joint government of the world by Gregory V. and Otto III. It says:—

Surgat Roma imperio, sub Ottone tertio!
Salve, papa noster, salve, Gregori dignissime
Cum Ottone te augusto tuus Petrus excipit.—
Vos duo luminaria per terrarum spacia
Illustrate ecclesias, effugate tenebras
Ut unus ferro vigeat, alter verbo tinniat.

Compare with this a song in the *purvus ordo Roman.*, printed from a Cod. Casin. by Di Costanzo. . . . S. Rufino Mart., Assisi, 1797, p. 423 f.:—

Sancta Dei Genetrix Romanam respice plebem,
Ottonemque fove Sancta Dei Genetrix.
Tertius Otto tue nixus solamine palme
Presto sit venie tertius Otto tue. . . .
Gaudeat omnis homo quia regnat tertius Otto.
Illius imperio gaudeat omnis homo.

in order to remove every hindrance to the great scheme of the restoration of the Christian universal Empire, the city should be subdued by the united forces of papal and imperial authority. The rebellious Romans who had banished John XV. were cited to appear. Their submission, however, to this Pope, whom they had again admitted into the city, as well as their subjection to the wishes of the Emperor, at whose hands they had received his successor, mitigated the sentence of the judges. The majesty of the young idealists would not permit them to stoop to the hated dictates of fear. No Roman was punished with death, but some popular leaders, amongst them Crescentius, were banished. The noble spirit of Gregory V., inexperienced to power, shrank from imposing even this punishment, and in hope of conciliating Rome by clemency, he implored the equally forgiving young Emperor to grant entire remission of the sentence. Crescentius tendered the oath of submission and remained in Rome, leading the life of a private citizen.

Crescentius does homage to the Emperor.

This act of impolitic forbearance, however, does honour rather to the hearts than to the judgment of Otto and Gregory.[1]

While a rebel escaped the fate of exile amid

[1] *Habitoque cum Romanis placito, quemdam Crescentium, quia priorem Papam injuriis saepe laceraverat, exilio statuit deportari, sed ad preces novi Apostolici omnia illi remisit.*—*Annal. Saxo* A. 996. Hock's assertion ("Gerbert," c. 9) that Gregory had pardoned Crescentius in order to use him as a counterpoise to the Germans in Rome, is utterly absurd. Otto dates a Privilegium for the convent of S. Salvator on Monte Amiata on the 25th May (*Dat. VIII. Kal. Jun. A. D. J. 996, Ind. IX. Imp. I. Actum·Rome.*—Cod. Amiatin. *ut supra*, p. 590). On May 27, Gregory V. issued his bull for the same convent, which he exempted. *Ibid.*, p. 592.—See Stumpf on this period.

barbarians—a sentence which the Romans even of the tenth century regarded as equal to death—the dreaded doom overtook a saint. Adalbert still lingered in the monastery of S. Bonifazio, but, being now summoned by the Duke of Bohemia and the Archbishop of Mainz, was again compelled to return to his orphaned diocese. The enthusiastic respect shown him by the young Emperor did not avail to shield him from the harsh decree. Accompanied by his faithful brother, Gaudentius, he returned with many tears to the barbarous north. The region was as uncongenial to him as to his friend Otto, of whose idealistic nature, his own, clad in the habit of monasticism, was the striking counterpart. Both the Saxon and the Bohemian loved Rome with a deep and fatal devotion. The restless Adalbert still found his bishopric utterly uncongenial, and after a protracted visit to Mainz and another to Tours, he finally sought a martyr's death among the savage Prussians.[1] He found it on April 23, 997. His remains were bought by Boleslaw, Duke of Poland, for their weight in gold, and were buried in the Cathedral of Gnesen, where the "Apostle of the Poles" received his earliest worship. He is still revered in Rome as the missionary of this people. His memory was preserved in the monastery of S. Bonifazio, and from this Abbey on the Aventine, as from a martyr colony, other brave apostles, fired by Adalbert's example, went forth

Adalbert leaves Rome, 996.

Worship of S. Adalbert.

[1] *Prussorum—quorum deus venter est et avaritia juncta cum morte*, says the *Vita S. Adalb.*, c. 27, a not very flattering compliment to my own country in those days, which in the Xth century was still inhabited by a half-savage people, but in the XVIIIth produced the philosopher Kant.

to the savage country of the Slavs. Conspicuous among them was Guadentius, the first bishop of the Church dedicated to his brother at Gnesen; he was followed by Anastasius, who had previously accompanied Adalbert to Bohemia, and who now became the friend and counsellor of Stephen, the first King of Hungary, and died as the first Archbishop of the Magyars in Kolocza; last came Boniface, a relation of Otto III., who took the cowl in Rome in 996, and later went to preach the Gospel to the Prussians and Russians.

Otto III. leaves Rome.

Meanwhile Otto III., having established his tribunal in the Eternal City and tranquillised the Romans by an amnesty, returned to Germany as Emperor in the beginning of June.[1] The charm which Rome exercised over his imagination was not yet so powerful as completely to estrange his heart from his native country, and he still felt himself a German King. No historian has recorded the measures which he took to secure Gregory against the enmity of the Romans. The device of permanent garrisons, by means of which kings are enabled to hold cities and provinces in obedience, was at this time unknown. Sovereigns could only rely on the fidelity of vassals, to whose hands they entrusted the highest offices, namely, the administration of justice. If Otto now appointed to the Patriciate a man devoted to his interests, made another Prefect, and nominated the

[1] On May 31, Otto III., then in Rome, took the convent of SS. Boniface and Alexius on the Aventine under his protection. Already on June 12 he issued a charter from Foligno. On Sept. 15 he was at Ingelheim. Stumpf, pp. 91, 92.

judges from a number of doubtful adherents, his measures were of no avail. His absence was the signal to the Romans for revolt. The national party made a desperate effort to shake off the German yoke, and their efforts to break the fatal spell under which Papacy and Empire held the city deserve our deepest sympathy.

Relation of the City of Rome towards the Papacy and the Empire.

Individualism for ever struggles against system. The right of the individual, although more limited in historical value than the right of system, is yet of earlier origin. In ancient republican Rome the long-continued struggles of the plebeians against the aristocracy present a spectacle worthy of admiration. They were healthy revolutions of the body politic itself, and out of these struggles the greatness of Rome developed, until the balance of the adverse elements was attained and the democracy gave place to the Empire. Rome no longer struggled under the rule of the Caesars, the opposing elements of civic life had been uprooted, and the revolutions were restricted to the Palace and the Praetorian Guards. After long centuries we find the Imperial and Papal city again excited by contending factions—the aristocrats, the citizens, the militia fighting against the Papacy and the Empire. These various forces summoned to their aid from the already myth-enshrouded graves of antiquity the ghosts of consuls, tribunes, and senators, who seem to have haunted Rome throughout the entire Middle Ages. The Empire, which the revolutionists desired to overthrow, was in nowise the terrible despotism of the ancient Caesars, but an ideal theocratic system which prevailed outside the city.

The territorial power of the Popes against which they contended was likewise a government far removed from all absolutism, in itself devoid of power and means, and strong only through a moral principle that pervaded the whole world. The city of Rome, however, found herself condemned to offer her civic freedom a sacrifice for ever to the greatness and independence of her high priest. Nature, which impels man to extend his powers in the state and in society; ambition and glory, the ever sweet if vain hopes which goad forceful men to strive for distinction, found themselves in harsh opposition to a state in which secular energies were stifled and where priests alone obtained advancement. If the Roman optimates reflected on the glory of the counts or princes in other cities of Italy—such as Venice, Milan, and Benevento—and if in later days the citizens of Rome contemplated the liberty and power of their equals in the northern or southern democracies, they must have inveighed against heaven or its representative, who had condemned them to an eternal political death. All the more must they have murmured when they remembered their great forefathers. The efforts of the Romans to uphold the right of their individuality against great universal systems were continued for centuries, and gave rise to the strangest contradictions. Roman emperors of German race termed peoples and kings their vassals, pacified their disputes, received their homage, disposed of their diadems, but were themselves forced to fight the Roman aristocrats in the streets of the city, and were often attacked and maltreated by the populace. The

popes prescribed laws to the world, and distant kings trembled at their very word; but the Romans drove them out of the city times innumerable, or dragged them, shrieking prisoners, to their fortresses. At length the unfortunate Romans bowed in subjection to the power of the system in view of whose world-wide significance their own tragic struggles and efforts often assumed a fantastic and quixotic character.

Meanwhile, we shall not trouble ourselves to contradict such authors as have stigmatised Romans like Alberic, Crescentius, and their successors as tyrants or criminals, because they refused to yield a slavish submission to emperors and popes. Patriotism is a sacred virtue inseparable from freedom, the highest moral conception of humanity. The national hatred of Romans to foreigners, their aversion to the rule of priests, was grounded on the essential nature of things and explicable at any time. We cannot, therefore, invest a Roman of the tenth century with the cloak of a Greek demagogue, the toga of a Brutus, or the fantastic mantle of a Cola di Rienzi. Crescentius was a brave man who cherished no vain delusions, a patriotic Roman who lived at a time when his native city was sunk in the deepest barbarism. He was handsome in form and feature, and of distinguished birth. Like Alberic he strove for temporal power, which, as Romans of the present day still assert, is only a leaden weight at the apostolic feet, drawing the Pope from heaven, his own uncontested domain, to a foreign and lower sphere.

Crescentius with his adherents conspired to overthrow the German Pope. The people found grounds

Revolt of the Romans under Crescentius Sept. 996.

for complaint in the fact that foreigners, ignorant of Roman law, administered justice and appointed judges, who, not being in the pay of the state, were corrupt and one-sided. If this reproach was true of the Counts in the non-Roman cities, Rome also had reason to murmur against the partisanship of the *Judices dativi*, or over the judges of the criminal courts, who had punished many citizens with imprisonment, confiscation of property, and exile.[1] The preceding revolutions had made a firm rule necessary. Many Roman nobles were deprived of their offices, while men of the most pronounced Imperial tendencies were raised to the highest administrative posts, and to judgeships. Gregory V. himself was not exempt from the reproach of having disposed of offices for money. While the German Pope surrounded himself with Germans and his creatures, and decided to impose the strict discipline of Cluny, in fact to effect an ecclesiastical reform in the corrupt city, the new order of things appeared to the Romans in the light of an odious tyranny.

Flight of Gregory V.

A revolt broke out; the Pope fled on September 29, 996. It seems strange that Gregory had not assured himself of the Castle of S. Angelo, or that if

[1] This is said in the fragment, *quot sunt genera judicum*, published by Blume in the *Rheinisches Museum*, v. 129, and by Giesebrecht, i. 825. I saw it in the *Cod. Vatican.*, 2037, of saec. xiii.: *ceterum postquam peccatis nostris exigentib. Romanor. imperium barbaror. patuit gladiis feriendum, Romanas leges penitus ignorantes inliterati ac barbari judices legis peritos in legem cogentes jurare, judices creavere quorum judicio lis ventilata terminaretur. Hi accepta abusiva potestate, dum stipendia a republica non accipiunt, avaritiae face succensi jus omne confundunt. Comes enim illiteratus ac barbarus nescit vera a falsis discernere, et ideo fallitur.*

he did so assure himself, his adherents should have made no resistance. The only fortress of the city must have been wrested from the nobles after Otto's coronation. Although it had frequently fallen into the hands of the Roman nobility, the fortress had not yet become private property. On the contrary, as one of the chief monuments of the city, it belonged to the State, and like the Leonine city, their own work, was in later times regarded by the popes as their peculiar property, and recognised as such by the Romans. S. Angelo was of no use as a place of refuge, since the popes did not live in the Vatican, but remained instead in the unprotected Lateran, defenceless against any sudden attack. Crescentius seized the fortress and filled it with armed men.

Gregory meanwhile hastened to North Italy, where he had summoned a Council at Pavia. In the beginning of 997, he here promulgated several statutes in matters regarding the churches of Germany and France. He showed princes as well as bishops that henceforward they must bow to the supremacy of Rome, and that the sacred chair would energetically uphold the decretals of Isidore against the schismatical provincial synods. He showed an exemplary calm with regard to his own banishment, and in moderate language required the German bishops to ratify the excommunications pronounced against the spoilers and robbers of the Church.[1] But while the banished

[1] The letter is addressed to Willigis of Mainz, the Pope's Chancellor in Germany: *Notum vobis etiam facimus, qualiter per communem consensum fratrum, Crescentium s. Rom. Eccl. invasorem et depraedatorem a gremio s. aecclesiae et omnium fidelium communione*

Pope excluded Crescentius from the communion of the faithful, the bold rebel had established his ephemeral rule in Rome before Otto returned, summoned probably by urgent letters from the Pope.

A general revolution had taken place in the administration after Gregory's flight. The existing judices were expelled; their places were filled with nationalists, and Crescentius again styled himself Patricius or Consul of the Romans. Aware of his own weakness, he sought an ally in Constantinople; and that the Greek Court did not stand aloof from the revolution we may gather from the following events. Before Otto had received the Imperial crown, he, like his father, had sent envoys to Constantinople to sue for the hand of a Greek princess. The embassy was conducted by John, Bishop of Piacenza, a Calabrian Greek from Rossano, originally known as Philagathus. He owed his rise from low estate to the favour of Theophano, at whose court he had arrived in extreme poverty. Here he soon became powerful; he obtained Nonantula, the wealthiest abbey in Italy, and during the regency of the Empress acquired the bishopric of Piacenza, which was created an archbishopric by John XV., and separated from the metropolis of Ravenna for his especial benefit.[1] Philagathus had gone to Constantinople

Philagathus of Rossano.

segregavimus, et ut unusquisque vestrum in suo episcopatu huic facto adsensum praebeat, caritative rogavimus.—Mon. Germ., v. 694.

[1] The German chroniclers say: *Hic Joh. natione Grecus, condit. servus, astu callidissimus, ad Imper. II. Ottonem sub paupere adiens habitu, interventu Theophanu Imperatricis regia primum alitus est stipe; deinde—pene inter primos habebatur. Annal. Quedlinb., Chronogr. Saxo, Thietmar Chron.*, iv. 21. The *Excerpta e Cata-*

in 995 to represent the Emperor's suit; he remained there sometime in negotiations with the court, and saw his ambitious hopes shattered by the election of Gregory V. He returned to the West, and indeed to Rome, in the spring of 997, invited thither either by the change in affairs or by the summons of Crescentius. Resolved on the tyranny or death —the Patricius would rather have acknowledged the supremacy of Byzantium than have borne the hated Saxon yoke—Crescentius accorded the Greek Philagathus a friendly reception, and offered him the Papal crown in return for a large sum of money. The dazzled favourite of Theophano, loaded with favours by the Ottos, and bound by spiritual ties to both Emperor and Pope (he had stood godfather not only to Otto III., but also to Gregory V.), betrayed his benefactors. He took the tiara from the hands of Crescentius in May 997, and called himself John XVI. Forming a compact with the Romans, who had elected him anti-pope, he resigned the temporal power to Crescentius and the nobility, but apparently demanded the recognition of the supremacy of the Greek Emperor, without whose aid he could never hope to maintain himself.[1]

John XVI., Anti-pope, May 997.

logo Tabularii Nonantul. (Muratori, *Ant.* V. 676) speak in a partisan spirit of Philagathus: *probis moribus, et scientia ornatum*, and say: *hunc Joh. abbatem* (that is of Nonantula, to which Otto II. had appointed him, A. 982) *Romani Crescentii Consulis Pontificem in Schismate contra Gregorium V. declararunt, A. Ch.* 996.

[1] When the Germans say: *Cresc. per Joh. Apostaticum Imp. sibi usurpavit, Imperium* signifies the Imperial rights. Several chroniclers speak of the alliance with Byzantium. *Chron. Venetum, Mon. Germ.*, ix. 31. *Joh.* (*sc. Crescentius*) *Johannem suum filium Constantin. destinavit, quem imperator—honorib. sublimavit.* Arnulf (*Histor.*

3. Rule of Crescentius — Otto advances against the City — Horrible fate of the Anti-Pope — Crescentius defends himself in S. Angelo — Varying Accounts of his Death—Mons Malus or Monte Mario—Epitaph of Crescentius.

Had the occupant of the Greek throne been a man of courage he would undoubtedly have gone to war to regain possession of Rome. Basil and Constantine, however, ingloriously dragged their burthen of power through an unusually long term of years, and Italy remained safe from another Byzantine invasion. No army advanced to Rome from Calabria; no fleet appeared at the entrance of the Tiber, and Philagathus soon repented that he had defied the warning of his sainted countryman Nilus. Gregory V. despised the usurper of his chair, and the united bishops of Italy, Germany, and France thundered anathemas against the treacherous Greek. In the meantime, the Imperial party having been subdued by the terrorism of the usurpers, Philagathus was recognised as Pope by the Romans, and even the Campagna yielded him obedience. Relations of

Mediol., i. 11) says of the Anti-pope: *de quo dictum est, quod Romani decus imperii astute in Graecos transferre tentasset. Benzonis Panegyr. in Heinr. III.*, Menken., i. 968: *Otto decollavit Crescentium et secavit papam Sergium* (!) *ex quod cum Graecis frequentabant inlicitum commercium.* Bonizo's fragment (*Mscr. Vat.*, 7143) contains nothing on the subject; it even says of the Anti-pope: *cum Romam orationis causa veniret, a praef. Crescentio et a Romanis coepitur et tenetur et licet invitus tamen Papa infelix ordinatus.* His statement that Crescentius made the courtier of Otto Pope in order to gain over the Emperor, is truly absurd. (*Ad amicum*, lib. iv. 800, in Oefele, ii.)

Crescentius dwelt in the Sabine mountains, and Count Benedict, the husband of Theodoranda, and his sons John and Crescentius, had profited by the rule of their cousin to annex property belonging to the Imperial monastery of Farfa. The Abbot of the monastery was Hugo, a man afterwards distinguished for his services, but who nevertheless had stooped to purchase his dignity from Pope Gregory.[1]

The usurpers were forced to recognise that the preparations for their defence were insufficient. Otto III., who had been detained in Germany in tedious wars against the Slavs, crossed the Alps at the end of the year 997. His exiled cousin, Gregory, met him at Pavia, where they celebrated Christmas. They then proceeded to Cremona, and afterwards to Ravenna and Rome. The monk Benedict, if still alive, may have watched the progress of their hosts as they marched past the foot of Soracte, and have raised a fresh lament over the fate of unfortunate Rome.

Otto, arriving before the city at the end of February 998, found its gates open, its walls undefended. S. Angelo alone was occupied by Crescentius and his

Otto III. conducts Gregory back to Rome, Feb. 998

[1] Hugo succeeded the Abbot Alberic at the end of 997; in *Destructio Farf.*, c. 17, he accuses himself: *illo mortuo, veni ego peccator Hugo, non ut legitimus, sed ut abhortivus.* Höfler, *Deutsche Päpste*, i. 130, believes that he had bought the abbey from Joh. XVI., but in this case Otto III. would scarcely have said in the Placitum of 998 (*Chron. Farf.* 492), *qui sibi Imperialis Abbatiae—absque nostro assensu regimen usurpaverat—et quod deterius est, pretio emerat a Romano Pontifice*; since this would have been a recognition of Philagathus. Gregory V. was accessible to gold; see the Placitum of Otto III., A. 999 (*Chron. Farf.* 499), from which it appears that the monks of S. Cosma had gained him over with money.

adherents, who thought to defy death in this fortress or tomb.[1] The Romans here showed that they merited their fate. It was unnecessary for them to recall the defence of the city under Belisarius; it was sufficient to remember the times of Alberic, and remind themselves that a like victory was still possible. But the people were torn by factions, and a great part of the clergy and nobility were Imperialists.

Fall of Philagathus.

Philagathus fled terror-stricken to the Campagna and hid himself in a tower, hoping to reach the Greeks either by land or sea. Imperial horsemen brought him back. The sham Pope was barbarously deprived of nose, tongue, and ears; his eyes were torn out; he was dragged back to Rome and thrown into the cell of a monastery.[2] Otto, who had entered the city unopposed, required Crescentius to lay down his arms, but, although he received a defiant answer, he delayed his attack on the fortress. He calmly held tribunals in the Lateran, and issued decrees for convents and churches, while the Pope allowed the wounds of Phila-

[1] *Chron. Venet.*, p. 31; Rodulfi Glaber, *Hist.*, i.; *Mon. Germ.*, ix. 56; *conscendens cum suis turrim, quae sita est extra civitatem trans Tiberim, ob altitudinem sui Intercelos vocatam vallavit eam, defensurus pro vita. Annal. Quedl., Chronogr. Saxo.* Otto was certainly in Rome on Feb. 22, since his Placitum for Farfa is dated 8 *Kal. Martii A.* 998, *Ind. XI. Anno Ottonis III. Regn. XV. Imper. II. Actum Romae feliciter.*

[2] *Chron. Venet.: procul a Roma inexpugnabilem turrim intravit, in qua non diu, vento imperatore, illum manere licuit. Sed ab ejus militibus captus, projectis oculis—Romam in quodam monasterio delatus est. Vita* in Ekkard; *ab Ottonis Vassore Birthilone correptus, amputatis naribus, etc.* Glaber, Bonizo, Amalr. Auger. also ascribe the ill-usage to the Emperor. The German chroniclers call his captors *non tantum Imperatoris, sed Christi amici* (*Annal. Saxo. Annal. Quedl.*, 998).

gathus time to heal. Gregory summoned a council in the Lateran in March; the appalling figure of the mutilated anti-pope here met the eyes of the bishops, when the sight of his sufferings might have softened even the hearts of Saracens. Philagathus was deprived of all his dignities; the Papal vestments, in which he had been forced to appear, were rudely torn from him. He was placed backwards on a mangy ass, while a herald walking before him announced that this was John who had dared to play the Pope. Amid the cries of the populace he was thus led through the city to prison, and in his dungeon disappears from sight.[1] Nothing better reveals the character of men than the manner in which the virtuous are rewarded and the guilty punished; and having witnessed a few examples of the penalties inflicted at this period, we may draw our inference with regard to society in the tenth century. If it be true that the Abbot Nilus came to Rome and endeavoured to save his unfortunate compatriot, the deed does honour to his memory. The incident is related in his biography, where we are told that the saint, nearly ninety years old, journeyed to Rome to implore the release of Philagathus. His entreaties, however, were unavailing, and after the infliction of the cruel sentence he left the city, but not without invoking the curse of heaven on the pitiless hearts of both Pope and Emperor.[2]

The actual author of the revolution still remained

[1] *Catal. Eccardi: in asino caudam ejus tenens, satis irrisorie per totam Romam ductus est.* So, too, *Chron. Venet.*

[2] *Vita Nili, Acta Sanctor.* for the 26th Sept., vii. c. 90. The *Mon. Germ.* give extracts from the Greek text, vi. 615-618.

Crescentius defends himself in S. Angelo.

defiant in S. Angelo. Crescentius here found himself without prospect of escape, even through flight, which he seems to have scorned. Deserted in Rome, where the populace immediately abjured him to become the spectators of one of the bloodiest of tragedies, while the Imperialist faction united with the Germans in attacking the fortress; unsupported by the barons on the Campagna, where his cousins in the Sabina remained expectant in their fortresses, Crescentius saw no other prospect of rescue than in the swords of the faithful friends who had shut themselves up and were ready to die with him. For although his end was to be foreseen, he was not betrayed by his followers, and his short but brave defence increased the glory of his name, which the populace long associated with S. Angelo. The celebrated Mausoleum, in itself strong as a fortress, in the course of time had become one. As early as the days of Charles the Great it had reckoned six towers and one hundred and sixty-four battlements; Crescentius had further added to the fortifications.[1] The Mausoleum was deemed impregnable; the knowledge of its defence by the Greeks must have still survived; Hugo's flight from it was fresh in the memory of all, as were the facts that the fortress had been the stronghold of the invincible Alberic, and that it had remained unconquered since

[1] Thietmar, iv. c. 21, and *Annal. Saxo*, A. 998, call S. Angelo *domus Theoderici* for the first time; it is, however, spoken of as *Castellum Crescentii* in Cencius. Pier Damiani calls it *Mons S. Angeli*, either on account of its size, or because the mountain-like Mausoleum of Augustus was called at that time *Mons Augustus*. Rud. Glaber and Ademar (*Hist.*, iii. c. 31) call S. Angelo *turris Intercelos*, from the church on its summit.

the time of the Goths. Crescentius successfully repulsed several attacks, and Otto was forced to lay siege to the Mausoleum according to the rules of military science.

He entrusted the siege to the Margrave Eckhard of Meiszen, who opened the attack immediately after Sunday in Albis. Crescentius manfully defended himself for a time. But the huge wooden towers and machines, built by the Germans, shook the fortress and the belief in its impregnability. The end of Crescentius is veiled in fable. It was said that, despairing of a lengthy resistance, he disguised himself in a cowl, came secretly to Otto's palace, and begged for mercy at his feet. The young Emperor asked his attendants why they had admitted the Prince of the Romans, who had made emperors, popes, and laws, into the dwelling of the Saxons? "Take him back," he said, "to the throne of his highness, until we have prepared a reception worthy of his dignity." Crescentius, reconducted to the fortress, valiantly defended himself, until S. Angelo was at length taken by assault, when the Emperor commanded that the prisoner should throw himself from the battlements in the sight of the people, in order that he might not be accused by the Romans of having secretly made away with their prince.[1] Another legend relates that Crescentius was seized in attempting to escape, was

[1] Such is the romance of Glaber, a monk of Cluny, in the middle of saec. xi.: *Cur, inquiens, Romanor. principem, imperator. decretorum* (this refers to the Byzantine alliance) *datoremque legum atque ordinatorem pontificum, intrare sinistis magalia Saxonum? Nunc quoque reducite eum ad thronum suae sublimitatis, donec ejus honori condignam videlicet praeparamus susceptionem.*

led, seated backwards on an ass, through the streets of Rome, was torn limb from limb, and was finally hanged outside the city.[1] Rumour also attributed his fall to shameless perfidy on the part of Otto. It was said that the Emperor, through his knight Tammus, assured Crescentius of safety, and that the Patricius, having surrendered himself into the Imperial power, was executed on a charge of high treason. Although this act of treachery remains unproved, the fact that Tammus embraced the monastic profession, and that Otto performed various penitential exercises, lends an aspect of probability to the statement. Crescentius' resistance was hopeless, and the Emperor was by no means obliged to resort to measures so unchivalrous to obtain the surrender of the fortress.[2] It is not improbable that the Consul of the Romans was forced to capitulate; and he may either have surrendered at discretion or, covered with wounds, have laid down his arms on receiving the assurances of the generals. These assurances, however, were not ratified by the Emperor. Crescentius, who had previously received

[1] Sigbert., *Gembl.*, *A.* 1001.

[2] Pier Damiani, who wrote nearly ninety years later (*Vita Romualdi*, Paris, 1664, i. 196): *Cui Tammus ex praecepto Regis jusjurandum securitatis praestitit, et ita ille deceptus.* Glaber relates that Otto chivalrously let him go to the fortress, in order that he might take it by assault. Glaber thus contradicts his younger contemporary Damiani. Landulfus, senior, ii. c. 19: *Crescentium ingenio, non armis cepit.* Before him (about 1085) Arnulfus wrote (*Hist. Mediol.*, c. 12): *pacto utrimque composito, illius se tradidit potestate.* Leo Ostien, ii. c. 18: *sacramento deceptum cepit, et mox quasi reum majestatis capite obtruncavit*, which he borrows from Damiani. Bonizo merely says *diu obsessum cepit et capite truncavit.* Ademar (*Hist.*, iii. c. 31) has the notice: *captus est insidiis suae conjugis.* We see how many different versions there were concerning the fate of the unfortunate hero of Roman liberty.

the Imperial pardon, had broken his oath, banished the Pope, set up an Anti-pope, and negotiated with the Byzantines; he was, therefore, well aware that his life was forfeit.

The fortress was taken by assault on April 29, 998. Crescentius was beheaded on the battlements; his remains were then thrown down, and were lastly exposed on a gallows below Monte Mario.[1] When Italian chroniclers relate that his eyes were first torn out, that his limbs were mutilated, and that he was dragged through the streets of Rome on the skin of a cow, we neither make any attempt to discuss the question, nor to speculate as to whether or not the infliction of such cruelties would have outraged the feelings of Otto III. or Gregory V., both of whom had calmly permitted such hideous tortures to be inflicted on the Anti-pope. The Romans themselves could

Execution of Crescentius, April 29, 998.

[1] Thietmar writes as a contemporary, being twenty-one years old at the time of Crescentius' fall (*Chron.*, iv. c. 21, *Annal Saxo*, which transcribes from him): *Tandem per machinamenta alte constructa ascendit* (Eckhard), *et eundem decollatum voce Imperatoria per pedes laqueo suspendit cum aliis duodecim. Catal. Eccardi: Captus et truncatus per pedes in Monte Malo suspensus est.* The *Vita Meinwerci*, c. x. p. 520 (Leibnitz, *Script. Brunsw.*, i.) says: *cum duodecim suis.* The *Annal. Quedl.* only: *illumque captum decollari, et e summo arcis praecipitatum in patibulo pedibus suspendi jussit.* The Chronicle of Lüneburg: *Crescentius quam do to stride nit deme Kaisere an dat Velt, unde wart gevangen, unde schendliche erhangen* (Eccard. I., xix. 1338). Arnulf of Milan records that he was beheaded on the Neronian Field; Landulf, that he was first deprived of all his limbs, and that his eyes were torn out. The *Venet. Chron.* (of Otto III.'s time): *Crescent. veniam miserabili voce adclamantem in summitate ut ab omnib. videretur decollaverunt, et projecto tellure alii — simili poena in Monte Gaudio imperiali decreto suspensi sunt.* Glaber has the tale of his being dragged on the skin of a cow, etc.

Monte Mario as a place of execution.

only look with hatred on those gallows on Monte Mario, the hill of the northern pilgrims, which rises over Ponte Molle like a monument of the history of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation. At the foot of this lofty hill, traversed by the ancient Via Triumphalis, lay the Neronian Field (*campus Neronis*), where the Imperial army had erected their tents. Here Crescentius was hanged, and with him twelve Romans, the Regionary captains of the city, who, like their leader, were sentenced to death—awful trophies of the hated yoke of the foreigner. A chronicler consequently traces the derivation of the name of the hill from this (for the Germans) fortunate occurrence. He speaks of the hill as *Mons Gaudii*, the Mount of Joy; called by the Romans, however, *Mons Malus*.[1] Another writer describes the unfortunate widow of Crescentius in the arms of brutal soldiers, to whom

[1] *Chronica Regia S. Pantaleonis* of saec. xii.: *idemque mons usque hodie ob triumphalem tyrannidis praesumptorem a Teutonicis Mons Gaudii, a Romanis autem M. Malus vocatur.* I, however, derive the name of *Mons Gaudii* from the rejoicings of pilgrims at the first sight of Rome. My view is supported by the fact that the crusaders called the spot named Biddu, outside Jerusalem, *Mons Gaudii*, because here the sacred city first came into view. The hill is called *Malus* for the first time by Ben. of Soracte, c. 26; he was acquainted with a church dedicated to S. Clement there. From M. Malus the name Monte Mario was probably derived. The ancient Romans called a part of the hill clivus *Cinnae*. Martial, Epigr. 4:

Hinc septem dominos videre montes
Et totam licet aestimare Romam.

The present Monte Mario was perhaps called *Mons Vaticanus* in ancient times. See on this subject Costantino Maes in *Cracas*, n. 42 (March 1888). The Triumphal Way led across the hill; to the Triumphal Way I refer an *Arcus Militorum*, as Ben. of Soracte calls what was probably an ancient triumphal arch on the Field of Nero: *a Prato S. Petri, hubi dicitur arcus Militorum* (c. 33).

she had been surrendered as the spoils of war. The legend, however, is an invention of Roman hatred, and Stephania was soon afterwards to appear in a quite different legendary character, namely, as the mistress of her husband's victor.[1] With more show of probability, we see the unhappy woman imploring the Emperor to grant her the remains of her executed husband, and, accompanied by her sorrowing friends, giving the corpse a Christian burial. If the Romans were justified in ascribing the death of their hero to perfidy, then was the choice of his resting-place determined with conscious purpose. He was buried on the Janiculum in the Church of S. Pancrazio, from ancient times the Defender of the Oath and the Avenger of Perjury.

Stephania, wife of Crescentius.

Crescentius is buried in S. Pancrazio.

The Romans long bewailed the ill-fated Crescentius,[2] and it is not without reason that from this time onward until late in the eleventh century, the name Crescentius is discovered, with such striking frequency, in the annals of the city. Many families bestowed it on their sons in memory of the brave champion of Roman liberty. An inscription—one of the best and most remarkable of the Roman Middle Ages—was placed over the grave of the patriot.[3] It breathes the sorrow-

[1] *Stephania autem uxor ejus traditur adulteranda Teutonibus.* —Arnulfus, *Hist. Mediol.*, c. 12. According to the Farfa Archives, the wife of Crescentius was named Theodora (*Reg. Farf.*, n. DIIII., in Fatteschi, p. 313). She may, however, have had two names. This was customary at the time. In documents we find: *Maroza quae et Atria; Maria que et Rogata; Panfila que Constantia vocatur; Triberga*, who signed herself Stefania. Even among men: *Johannes qui et Milo; Johannes qui et Rustico*; and countless other instances of the same kind.

[2] *Pro eo planctus magnus factus est.*—Ademar, *Hist.*, iii. c. 31.

[3] [Destroyed in the restorations under Cardinal Torres in 1609.—*Translator.*]

laden spirit of the past as inspired by the ruined world of the Eternal City.

Poor worm, who fain in palaces wouldst dwell,
Thy home must be this strict confining cell.
He to whom Rome her glad allegiance gave,
Lies now unhonoured in this obscure grave,
The mighty Duke Crescentius, to whose share
Fell noble ancestry and beauty rare.
Strong stood the land of Tiber in his day,
Then turned submissive to her Pontiff's sway.
For round the fickle wheel of Fortune spun,
And horror closed what glory had begun.
Oh thou, whoe'er thou art, who passest by,
Under like chance 'tis thine to live and die;
Then spare thy fellow man at least a sigh.[1]

[1] *Vermis homo putredo, cinis, laquearia quaeris.*
His aptandus eris sed brevibus gyaris.
Qui tenuit totam feliciter ordine Romam
His latebris tegitur pauper et exiguus,
Pulcher in aspectu dominus Crescentius et dux
Inclyta progenies quem peperit sobolem.
Tempore sub cujus valuit Tyberinaque tellus
Jus ad Apostolici valde quieta stetit.
Nam fortuna suos convertit lusibus annos
Et dedit extremum finis habere tetrum.
Sorte sub hac quisquis vitae spiramina carpis
Da mihi vel gemitum, te recolens socium.

[For the translation I am indebted to a friend.—*Translator.*]

Baronius read this epitaph in S. Pancrazio, and published it for the first time, *Annal. Eccl. A.* 996. The penultimate couplet shows that it refers to the ill-fated hero. The fourth couplet is obscure; the poet seems to speak in veiled language of the government of Crescentius and the return of Rome to subjection under Gregory V. He dared not speak the truth, but the *Nam* in the fifth distich expresses a conclusion from his hidden thought. He means to say that Rome, which Crescentius had vigorously ruled, again became papal, for the hero was overthrown by the fickleness of fate. The reader will have noticed the first appearance of Leonine rhymes.

CHAPTER VI.

1. Consequences of the Fall of Crescentius—His Relations in the Sabina—Hugo, Abbot of Farfa—Condition of this Imperial Monastery—Remarkable Lawsuit between the Abbot and the Presbyters of S. Eustachius in Rome.

Otto's criminal tribunal, even more appalling than the tribunal of his grandfather, filled the city with terror. The young emperor in one of his diplomas, however, records with satisfaction the day of Crescentius's execution; he fully believed that he had finally subdued Rome.[1] The relations of the rebel also felt the consequences of his tragic fall. In the hope of extending their authority in the Sabina, they had clung to Crescentius as long as he was powerful, but at the time of his overthrow had prudently remained aloof. The sense of nationality never existed in the Campagna; there were no Romans outside Rome; no feeling of oneness ever united the inhabitants—severed by race and laws—of Roman territory. While the Roman Curial constitution had long perished in the

[1] Otto's writings in Mabill., *Annal. Ben.*, iv. 117, dated *III. Kal. Maji A.* 998, *quando Crescentius decollatus suspensus fuit.*

provincial towns, a free citizen class had scarcely arisen before barons, bishops and abbots rose powerful above the mass of the coloni and bondsmen. All strove to obtain possession of the country towns or fortresses, and in many cases the popes invested influential families or bishoprics and convents with estates. Feudalism spread throughout the Roman territory; in some instances nobles took possession of entire districts, and from the middle of the tenth century, the baronial system of a secular as well as a spiritual nature became rooted in the soil, to survive as a curse of agriculture until our own days.

From the eleventh century onwards, we shall find Tusculum and Praeneste the centres of feudalism in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome. At the end of the tenth, however, the family of Count Benedict, which was related by marriage to Crescentius, ruled in the Sabina. This powerful noble dwelt in the fortress of Arci. He had seized and subjugated several places belonging to Farfa, and his sons, John and Crescentius, strove to emulate his example. Benedict seized the episcopal town of Caere, the ancient Etruscan Agylla, not as yet known as *Caere vetus* (Cervetri). The fall of Crescentius filled him and his sons with dismay. Count John forthwith surrendered half of an estate which he had taken from Farfa, and the Abbot gave him a deed of tenure of the "third class" over the other half, together with the disputed fortress of Tribucum.[1]

The Crescentii in the Sabina and Caere.

[1] Hugo, *Destruct. Farf.*, p. 541. Concerning the dispute between Farfa and this Count, see Galletti's treatise on the Sabine Gabii.

Meanwhile, other estates belonging to the monastery, and even to the Roman Church, remained in Benedict's power. Hugo, the Abbot, hastened to demand justice in Rome. Crescentius, the brother of John, a young and thoughtless man, came to the city, which was still filled with horror at the execution of his uncle. He probably desired by his dauntless demeanour to make it appear that he had borne no part in his uncle's doings, or perhaps hoped to effect his object by means of bribery. The Emperor and the Pope, however, had him arrested. Benedict, his father, hastened to Rome, formally restored Caere to the Pope, but promptly retired to his fortress and there held himself intrenched. When a country baron, a relation of Crescentius, thus ventured immediately after the death of the rebel to defy both Emperor and Pope, we may imagine the nature of the foundations on which papal and imperial power rested in the city. These foundations were and remained purely ephemeral, and the emperors, who boasted of being the successors of Augustus, no sooner entered Roman territory than they found themselves obliged to set their troops to the task of laying siege to petty fortresses. The ruler of Rome was now obliged to depart at the head of a military force to drive Benedict out of Caere. He left accompanied by the Pope and the Abbot with the captive Crescentius. The father laughed at the threat of hanging his son, but looking from the walls of the fortress beheld him led to the gallows, and yielded. He surrendered Caere to the Pope, and received his son. Emperor, Pope, and Abbot

immediately returned to Rome. Although the refractory baron solemnly vowed to renounce his illegal claims, his son ridiculed the oath and pressed Farfa yet more closely than before.[1]

With the object of curbing the arrogance of the petty tyrants in the Sabina, both Emperor and Pope strove to maintain themselves in possession of Farfa.

Condition of Farfa.

On the death of Campo in 966, the Abbey had been made over *per commendam* to Leo, Abbot of S. Andrea on Soracte, a step which had only served to hasten its decline. John, an unbridled debauchee, was elected Abbot, but was deposed by Otto II., when the Emperor appointed Adam in his stead. The latter appointment caused a division in the Abbey, and on Otto's death, John seized the Sabine, Tuscan, and Spoletan property, while Adam ruled in the March of Fermo. On his arrival at Farfa in 996, Otto III. fixed the exact extent of the Abbey lands in a diploma, and thus united the

The Abbot Hugo.

monastic territory under the Abbot John.[2] On John's death in 997, Hugo, in opposition to the Canonical rules, purchased the dignity of Abbot from Gregory V. He had entered the monastery of Monte Amiata at the age of sixteen; in his twenty-fourth year he seized the crozier of Farfa, to enter on a long

[1] In 988 John was Comes and Rector of the Sabina; in 994 Crescentius (Fatteschi, *Serie*, Appendix). Between 994 and 999 no Comes is any longer mentioned here. In 999 Gerardus, an adherent probably of Emperor and Pope, held the office, but in 1002 John again appears as Comes, and in 1003 Rainerius and Crescentius.

[2] Privilegium in the *Chron. Farf.*, p. 479.—*Act. Sabinis in Curte S. Gethulii VIII. Kal. Junii A.* 996 *ejus Imp. Regni XIII. Imperii quoque I.*

and honourable reign, and to compile the valuable volumes which describe the conditions of the time.[1] He was deposed as a usurper by Otto III., and the Abbey was then made over to other hands. The entreaties of the monks, however, and the talents of the deposed Abbot, found favour with the Emperor. He reinstated Hugo on February 22, 998, and revived the ancient law, by which the Abbot of Farfa, after having been elected by the monks, was first to obtain ratification from the Emperor as patron of the monastery, and afterwards be consecrated by the Pope.[2]

Hugo's restoration was a benefit to the Abbey. He was zealous in furthering the reform of Cluny, and indefatigable in his exertions for the recovery of the monastic property. We frequently discover him before the imperial tribunal in Rome, armed with the diplomas of his monastery, and invariably see him issue victorious from the trial. The records of these trials, which bring us into immediate contact with the administration of justice in the tenth century, still awaken our interest. The account of one may serve the historian as a picture of the conditions then existing. The age portrayed, although rude and violent,

[1] Bethmann has edited them as *Hugonis Opuscula*, and has collected various writings relating to Farfa under the title of *Historiae Farfenses* in tom. viii. of the *Mon. Germ.* Hugo wrote his *Liber Destructionis Farf.* after the year 1000.

[2] *Electus quisque ab eadem Congregatione prius ejusdem Imperiali patrocinio praesentatus gratis roboretur, et tunc a S. Pont. canonice consecretur. Dat.* 8 *Kal. Martii A.* 998. *Ind. XI. ann. Ottonis III. Regnantis XV. Imper. II. Act. Romae fel. in Dei nom. Amen.* This *Praeceptum* in the *Chron. Farf.*, p. 492.

was humanised by the respect which encompassed the law. Popes and kings of present times would consider themselves humilated were they requested to descend in person to the presence of a civil tribunal to settle civil disputes. The conception of the royal power has long been removed from the province of immediate and personal operation, and been transformed into an impotent abstraction. But in these semi-patriarchal times, the judicial majesty was accounted the highest and most sacred function of the sovereign power, and after the days of Charles the Great emperors frequently took their place on the judge's seat. These tribunals gradually became less frequent, and under the Ottos we meet with only a few Roman Placita particularly associated with the Imperium.

Suit brought against the Abbey of Farfa, 998.

On April 8, 998, the presbyters of S. Eustachio in Rome took proceedings against the Abbot of Farfa. The presbyters claimed the surrender of the churches of S. Maria and S. Benedict in the Thermae of Alexander, which belonged to the monastery, and asserted that this monastery had paid them taxes for the churches. The regular Roman tribunal, which consisted of imperial and papal judices, assembled outside the doors of S. Peter's, near S. Maria in Turri. The Emperor appointed the Archdeacon of the Imperial Palace as his representative and as President, and nominated John the Prefect of the City and Count Palatine as his assessor, while two Palatine judges, the Chief Defensor and the Arcarius, with three Judices Dativi, were added as assessors on the side of the Pope. Farfa had always stood under Lombard law, and the Abbot Hugo consequently

refused either to recognise Roman law or to instruct a Roman advocate. He pleaded the rights of his nationality as a man of German race in Rome, where such rights had been recognised since the time of the Constitution of Lothar. The President grew violent, seized him by the cowl, and dragged him down on the seat beside him.[1] With the sanction of the Emperor, however, Hugo was permitted to return to Farfa in order to fetch his own Lombard advocate, and three days later he appeared with Hubert, Proctor of the monastery. He produced a diploma of Lothar and the ratification of Pope Paschalis, which showed that his monastery, like other monasteries in the Frankish Empire, could only be judged by Lombard law. He declared himself ready to swear to the genuineness of the documents, or to prove them by duel and witnesses. His adversaries declined the test, and strove to prevent the case being decided by Lombard law ; the President, however, forced them to recognise it. The accusing presbyters were allowed a Roman advocate, Benedict, son of Stephen of the Market, under the Theatre of Marcellus, who immediately formulated the complaint against the Abbot. No Lombard judges, however, being present, the President got out of the difficulty by rough-and-ready means. He appointed Hubert,

[1] *Manibus suis eum comprehendit per cucullam et juxta se sedere fecit cui et dixit: hodie non exies de isto placito nisi legem feceris.* "Placitum" is the act of justice no less than the judicial decision, trial as well as sentence, and the usual term *legem facere* here signifies, to allow it to be decided by verdict, or to answer before the law. This Placitum in the *Chron. Farf.*, p. 505, in the *Reg. Farf.*, n. 459, and in Galletti, *del Prim.*, xxi.

Advocate of the Monastery, as judge, and forced him to swear on the Gospels that he would judge uprightly. The Abbot remonstrated that he was left without an advocate, and a native of the Sabina was consequently appointed counsel for the defence. The Sabine, who was unacquainted with law, knew not how to answer; he was therefore consigned to Hubert, now acting as judge or assessor, for instruction. The Lombard judge, in conformity with Lombard law, insisted on the accused party swearing that for forty years the monastery had been in possession of the two churches. The presbyters, however, tried to destroy the effect of the oath; in accordance with Roman law, they sought through witnesses to prove that within the forty years they had levied taxes on the monastery. The witnesses, being separately examined, were found contradictory and false; and after the presbyters had refused to prove the truth by oath, their complaint was rejected, and they were sentenced to resign the churches in question to the monastery.[1] According to legal usage, the document containing the subject of complaint, or, in case of forgery, the spurious document, was taken from the hands of the condemned. A judge cut a cross in it with a knife, and gave it into the hands of the successful disputant, in order that it might be retained as an archive, and produced in case of necessity. At the same time a renewal of the suit was forbidden, on penalty of a fine of ten pounds in gold, one-half of which was to go to the Imperial

[1] The customary legal expression is: *refutare* (Italian, *rifiutare*): *refutare ipsas ecclesias domno abbati.*

Palace, the other to the monastery.[1] Owing to the great uncertainty which prevailed both in civil and political affairs, the same suit was as a rule repeated times innumerable. It was even dragged on with incredible obstinacy for nearly a whole century, and was in fact renewed as often as the disputants found the circumstances favourable, and hoped, either by bribery of the judges or through the change of authorities, to succeed in their fraudulent design.[2]

The acts of the trial were entered in a document, which was signed by the Judges and Proctors and given to the Abbot. This document is still found among the Farfa archives, and shows us how naive and curt were the forms of judicial procedure of this age; also the difficulty and confusion with which, owing to the different legal systems, they were encumbered. The uncertainties of law were endless; all doors were open to fraud and bribery; and we may judge what protection remained for the burgher or colonus.

[1] *Arcarius Leo—tulit cultrum et signum s. crucis in ea* (that is to say, *carta per quam litigabant*) *abscindendo per medium fecit, et reliquit in manu Domni abbatis.* Muratori refers to this Placitum in his *Diss.* 34, in order to show how many forged documents were at this time in circulation. I refer further to *Dipl.* xxiv. in Galletti (*Del Prim. A.* 999), where the Abbot of S. Cosma and Damiano in Trastevere tries fraudulently to acquire property by means of a false diploma.

[2] This case of Farfa was repeated in 1010, and several times in the XIth century. The monastery went to law again on account of the fortresses Arci and Tribuco in 1068. A law-suit with S. Cosma and Damiano in Mica aurea (Trastevere), on account of S. Maria in Minione, near Civita Vecchia, lasted until 1083, consequently nearly a hundred years.

2. Legal Administration in Rome — The Judices Palatini or Ordinarii—The Judices Dativi—Formula for the Institution of the Roman Judges—Formula for the Bestowal of Roman Citizenship — Criminal Judges — Consuls and Comites with Judicial Authority in the Country Towns.

The judiciary system of Rome.

The Roman Placitum affords us an opportunity for making some remarks upon the system of justice in Rome in the time of Otto III. In every trial we find two classes of judges—the Palatini and the Dativi. With the former class we became acquainted as early as the eighth century, in the form of the seven papal ministers. They continued to form the ordinary Court of Justice in civil matters after the restoration of the Empire. As the Lateran, however, assumed also the form of an Imperial Palatinate, the Judices Palatini became at the same time imperial judges, and could be employed by the Emperor as well as the Pope, as assessors taking part in the judgment. The peculiar circumstances in which Rome stood—her overlord the Emperor, her territorial ruler the Pope—fostered the curious blending of the two powers, which were represented in common as the judicial system. The Primicerius and the Secundicerius, the Arcarius and the Saccellarius, the Protoscriniar, Primus Defensor and Adminiculator were invested at the same time with the dignity of imperial officials. The times when these papal ministers had tyrannised over Rome were past; the old

official hierarchy had been broken by the Carolingians as well as by the Popes. The Judices Palatini, however, remained under the presidency of the Primicerius, the first college of officials in Rome. They conducted the papal elections, they prescribed the ceremony of the coronation of the Emperor whom they surrounded, and as it were ordained, as the seven Lateran bishops ordained the Pope. The Primicerius and Secundicerius appear as Chancellors of the Empire, and as they escorted the Pope in processions, so likewise on solemn occasions they walked by the side of the Emperor.[1] The seven Palatini, as the permanent supreme College of Judges of the twofold Palatinate, were also called Judices Ordinarii. In none of the revolutions that had taken place in Rome had they lost their judicial authority, and we have seen that Alberic, as well as Emperor and Pope, had made use of them. On the other hand, the Duces of old had been deprived of their authority. They are mentioned by the side of the Judices in the Constitution of Lothar of the year 824; in the days of the Ottos, however, they no longer retained such functions. The Roman judicial system had suffered many changes since the time of Charles the Great. The judicial authority of the military and civil officials, which had been legal in the Byzantine period,

The seven Palatine judges.

[1] *In Romano vero Imperio et in Romana usque hodie ecclesia septem judices sunt palatini, qui Ordinarii vocantur, qui ordinant Imperatorem, et cum Romanis clericis eligunt Papam. Hi dextra laevaque vallantes imperatorem, quodammodo cum illo videntur regnare, sine quibus aliquid magnum non potest constituere imperator.* This well-known fragment is in the *Cod. Vat.* 2037. I believe that these Palatini gave legal form and order to the papal election.

disappeared under Frankish rule to make way for freer German institutions, such as were developed in the system of assessors. Thus, after the middle of the tenth century, we discover Judices Dativi in Rome itself, and after 961 frequently come across them in documents, while mention is made of them in Ravenna as early as 838.

Dativi.

The nature of these dativi is not as yet entirely clear to us. According to their name they were appointed in the capacity of assessors by the highest legal authorities—by the Emperor, Pope, Patricius, or in the provincial towns by the Comes. They have justly been regarded as a German institution, and been compared with the Scabini, permanent Frankish officials, who were elected under the influence of the Counts from the yeomen of the district or the jurisdiction, in order to sit in judgment and to pronounce sentence, as learned in the law.[1] Documents show that in North Italy the dativi received their names from the cities where they acted as judges, and that they retained the title even in death.[2] With regard to Rome, however, it cannot be proved that they were chosen by consent of the citizens. On the contrary, they appear invariably as having been "given" alone

[1] Savigny, i. sect. 68; Leo, *Entw. der Verf. der lombard. Städte*, p. 57; The X. Diss. of Muratori. According to a law of Charles the Great, seven Scabini were obliged to attend every Placitum as assessors, but the number was seldom complete.

[2] The passages are given after Fantuzzi in Hegel, i. 329; Savigny, i. 372. Bethmann-Hollweg (*Urspr.*, &c., 193–200) calls them a sort of hybrid between assessors pronouncing judgment and magistrates. The word *datus* was sometimes used instead of *dativus: Adrianus datus judex. Laetus Dei grat. dat Jud.* Placitum of Otto III. A. 999, *Chron. Farf.*, 501.

by the Emperor or the Pope, and, so far from being assessors appointed by the community as in Northern Italy, that they could occasionally be designated as Palatine judges.[1] The highest secular dignitaries appear as Dativi. We find Theophylact as Consul and Dativus Judex, and John as Prefect, Count Palatine, and Dativus Judex, while again other Dativi appear without any other dignity. Thus, as soon as Hubert, Counsel for the Abbey of Farfa, became transformed into a judge pronouncing sentence, he was called Hubert Dativus.[2]

The Roman courts of justice were therefore composed of the Ordinarii and the Dativi. Under the presidency of the judge, ordinarii and dativi were, as a rule, united to the number of seven, while an indefinite number of optimates (*nobiles viri*) assisted at the tribunal.[3] Ordinarii and dativi were classed

[1] I find at least: *Benedictus Domini nutu dativus Judex S. Palatii*, in Marini, n. 102, *A.* 961.

[2] This by itself shows in opposition to Savigny (i. 373) that the judicial office of the *dativus* could also be commissarial. It is also a mistake to use *praefectus* as synonymous with *dativus* (i. 374). *Dativus* denotes the office of a judge; the adjuncts, however, such as *consul et dativus*, *tribunus et d.*, *comes palatii et d.*, relate to the rank of the person, and have nothing to do with the *dativus*. Savigny (i. sect. 113), outside the Exarchate and Rome, only knows *dativi* in Pavia and Milla. Documents nevertheless show *dativi de civitate Narniensi*, *de civ. Hortana* (*Cod. Farf. Sessor.*, cc. xviii., n. 466, A. 1003), and *dativi* of Tibur (*ibid.*, n. 453, A. 1003).

[3] A document of July 28, 966, shows the three constituent parts of the Roman tribunal: *cum ordinariis judicib. et Joh. atque Guido dativi judices*, *nec non et nobili viris*, *vid. Gumpizo*, *Joh. de Mitzina etc. qui adstant.* Here *dativi* and *nob. viri* evidently correspond, as the Frankish *scabini* and *boni homines* (in general, freemen of the rank of assessors)—Giesebrecht, i. 822.

together as essentially Roman judges (*Judices Romani* or *Romanorum*), and called themselves "By the Grace of God, judges of the Holy Roman Empire" (*Dei Gratia sacri Romani Imperii Judex*). In the time of the Ottos the appointment of the dativus appears to have been associated with a solemn ceremony.

Formula on the appointment of the Dativus.

"When a judge is to be appointed he must be led by the Primicerius to the Emperor, who, addressing the Primicerius, says: 'Primicerius, see that he is neither poor nor the slave of any man, so that he may not injure my soul by bribery.' To the judge the Emperor must say: 'Take care never to subvert the laws of our most sacred predecessor Justinian'; and the judge must answer, 'May I be for ever accursed if I do.' The Emperor then must make the candidate swear never on any occasion whatever to infringe the law. He must invest the newly-made judge with the mantle, turning the buckle of it to the right, the clasp to the left, as a sign that the law should always be open before him, false witness silent in his presence. The Emperor must then place the book of the law in his hand, saying: 'Judge Rome and the Leonine city and the whole world according to this book,' and dismiss him with a kiss." [1]

[1] *Et det ei in manum librum codicum et dicat: secundum hunc librum judica Romam et Leonianam Orbemque universum; et det ei osculum et dimittat eum.* Formula, *qualiter judex constituendus sit*, in the *Col. Vat.* 4917, of saec. xi., and the copy in the *Cod. Vat.* 1983, at the end of the history of Paul Diaconus, and at the end of the *Graphia*. Here we have undoubtedly the appointment of a judex of Otto III.'s time. Compare with this the later papal formula, *qualiter judex et scrinarius a Romano Pontif. instituantur*, after Cencius Camerarius in Murat., *Ant. It.*, i. 687.

The proud but ridiculous words which command the Roman judge to judge the universe, as well as the Leonine city, according to the code of Justinian, corresponded to the newly revived idea of the cosmopolitan character of Rome, which, as early as the time of Otto III., had found expression in the well-known Leonine motto: "*Roma caput mundi regit orbis frena rotundi.*" The fame of Roman citizenship was also revived. It flattered the Romans to behold Franks or Lombards sueing for the privilege of being allowed to enrol themselves under the protection of the Roman law: a privilege which was accorded them with pompous solemnity. "If any one desires to become a Roman," so runs the formula, "he must humbly send his faithful friend to the Emperor, and entreat him that he may be placed under Roman law, and inscribed in the list of Roman citizens. The Emperor having granted the request, the order of procedure shall be as follows:—The Emperor shall sit with his noble judges and magistrates; two judges shall advance before him with bowed heads and say, 'Our Emperor, what does thy high Imperium command?' The Emperor shall reply, 'That the number of Romans may be increased, and that he who is made known to me to-day may be placed under Roman law.'"[1] The Roman civic rights.

Criminal justice was exercised in Rome by the Prefect and other permanent judges, who were called Consuls, and whose instructors were known as Pedanei.[2] The jurisdiction of these officials was Criminal Judges.

[1] *Qualiter romanus fieri debeat.* The last of the three formulas (interrupted).—*Cod. Vat.*, 4917, 1983, *Graphia.*

[2] *Judicum alii sunt palatini quos ordinarios vocamus; alii consules*

probably divided according to the regions of the city, and was committed to the Prefect of the city, since it was scarcely likely that these Consuls acted simply as judges outside Rome, or that their courts were merely local courts outside the city.[1] As little as we know of the Roman juridical system, so little do we know of that of the cities outside. These cities were still administered by duces, comites, and vice-comites, even by Gastaldi and apostolic Missi, who in their turn appointed their judges. The duces henceforward very rarely appear. They were evidently supplanted by the Frankish Counts who sprang up in every direction, so that the ancient duchies became transformed into counties.[2] The former tribunes also

Judges in the provincial towns.

distributi per judicatus: alii Pedanei a Consulibus creati (*i.e.*, *nostri judices* according to the Gloss., *Cod. Vat.*, 2037), and further: *qui dicuntur consules judicatus regunt et reos legibus puniunt et pro qualitate criminum in noxios dictant sententiam.* This fragment, *quot sunt genera judicum*, from *Cod. Vat.*, 2037, has been edited by Mabillon, recently and completely by Giesebrecht.

[1] In a document from Velletri, of the year 997, Consuls appear as judges in civil matters, and are appointed by an abbot. See further below. Hegel (i. 332) refers the *judicatus* definitely to the papal territory outside Rome. Bunsen (i. 223), like Savigny, refers it to Rome. Why should not these institutions apply to Rome as well as to the papal territory? I remark further that the title *consul* is very frequent in documents of the x. saec.

[2] Papal diploma A. 1018, in Marini, n. 42, for the Bishop of Portus: *quicumque vero presumptor sive Dux*, *sive Comes*, *vel Vicecomes*, *aut cubicularius*, *vel a nra Aplica sede Missus*, *aut qualiscumque interveniens Potestas* (the later *podestà*) *que de ipsa civitate Portuense dominatum tenuerit*, &c. Portus stood under a *comes*. A Gastaldus, however, in the capacity of papal overseer, levied the taxes. The diploma consequently calls Portus a *Castaldatus*, so that the titles of Lombard magistrates appear in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome. In the fragment *quot sunt genera judicum*, the office of the comes is

ceased to be rectors of the smaller towns. Their titles are frequently merely honorary, or else are used to mark the actual position of municipal officials and judges of these places.[1]

3. The Imperial Palatinate in Rome — Imperial Guard — Count Palatine — Imperial Fiscus — Papal Palatinate and Camera — Taxes — Diminution of the Lateran Revenues — Squandering of the Property of the Church — Exemptions of the Bishops — Recognition of Feudal Contracts by the Roman Church about the Year 1000.

The Imperial Palatinate.

We have spoken at length of the Roman Palatine judges; the nature of the Imperial Palatinate, nevertheless, remains somewhat obscure at this period. Originally intended to be united with the papal palace, in the ordinary course of things the two soon became distinct. Each had its own household, its

specified as something non-Roman: *Comes enim illiteratus ac barbarus.* Tivoli and Segni stood under Counts (Murat., *Ant.*, v. 379, v. 773) and Gastaldi (Marini, *Annot.*, n. 31, p. 232; Tusculum, Alife, Horta, Terracina, Traetto under Counts. Albano stood under a Dux (Murat., *Ant.*, v. 774).

[1] Savigny (i. sect. 115) wrongly says that tribunes do not appear after saec. x. They are found, however, in Horta, Sutri, Camerino. *Ego Adalgisi tribunus tabellio civ. Sutrine* A. 948. Galletti, *Msr. Vat.*, 8048, p. 8; *Cod. Farf. Sessor.*, ccxviii. n. 461, A. 1004; n. 466, A. 1005; *Cod.*, ccxii. p. 154, as late as A. 1068. *Leo tribunus et dativ. jud. et Tabellarius civ. Hortanae. Petrus tribun. et dativ. Leo trib. Beringerius tribun. et Dei gr. jud. et tabellar. civ. Hortanae.* This corresponds to the *consul et dativus jud.* in Rome. These tribunes were therefore no longer military tribunes. An ancient Roman title is thus found in saec. xi. among the Lombards in Tuscan and Spoletan territory.

own revenues. After the time of Charles, the Emperors dwelt at S. Peter's, occasionally in the Lateran, but possessed no residence in the city. Although Otto I. had built a palace in Ravenna, he had never contemplated building one in Rome. The idea of such a palace first seems to have been conceived by Otto III., who, but for the mass of ruins on the Palatine, would probably have constructed an Imperial fortress within the ancient Palace of the Caesars. He erected one instead on the Aventine beside S. Bonifazio, or perhaps transformed some ancient palace to answer to his needs.[1] He here lived encompassed by Byzantine ceremonial, and surrounded himself with a host of palace dignitaries, on whom he bestowed the most curious titles. At their head stood the Magister Palatii Imperialis.[2] An Imperial guard, composed exclusively of nobles, German as well as Roman, surrounded his person. The formula of admission to this body has been preserved in the *Graphia*. The Miles receives from the tribune the spurs; from the Dictator the coat of mail; from the Capiductor the lance and shield; from the Magister Militiae the iron greaves; from the Caesar the plumed helmet; from the Imperator the girdle, with the insignia, sword,

Imperial guard.

[1] *Gesta Ep. Camerac.*, i. c. 144: *in antiquo Palatio, quod est in monte Aventino versabatur*, and the Aventine is described as a splendid quarter. Tangmar (*Vita Bernwardi*, c. 19): *Otto festinans a palatio fere duo miliaria ad S. Petrum.* This distance suits the Aventine.

[2] Albericus, son of Gregory (*qui de Tusculana*), is thus mentioned in the *Regest. Farf.*, n. 470 (A. 999). He appears as *praefectus navalis*, Gregorius Miccinus as *vestarius S. Palatii.* A *logotheta S. Palatii* appears in a diploma of Classe, A. 1001 (Mittarelli, *App.*, 66, p. 161).

ring, collar, and bracelets. Byzantine and Roman customs are evidently here mingled together. The Imperial militia consisted of two cohorts, each of 555 men, and each commanded by a Comes, at whose head, however, stood the Imperial Count Palatine, an official who was placed "over all counts in the world, and entrusted with the care of the palace."[1] In Otto III.'s time the *Comes sacrosancti Palatii Lateranensis* is first mentioned. This dignity was conferred on the Roman Peter in 1001, but would also seem to have been borne by John the Prefect in 998, John signing himself *comes palatii* in his Farfa Placitum. There were, however, already several Counts of the Palatinate.[2] These officials also belonged to the Papal court, and hence passed into the Imperial. In succeeding ages, Emperors and Popes conferred the title until finally it lost all its earlier significance. It is impossible, however, to conceive of the office at this period apart from its corresponding jurisdiction, and appeal was probably made to the Count Palatine in cases which concerned the Imperial treasury.

The Lateran Count Palatine.

The existence of an Imperial Fiscus in Rome is undoubted. The Emperor here possessed various royal prerogatives. It was but natural also that

The Fiscus.

[1] See the *Graphia*, which makes him at the same time *Dictator Tusculanensis*. The *Graphia* is only to be used with discretion. *Reg. Farf.*, n. 470: *Gerardo grat. Dei inclito comite, atque Imperialis Militiae Magistro.*

[2] Ann. 983, *Sergius com. Palat.* (Mur., *Ant.*, i. 379), the same, A. 998 (Marini, n. 106, p. 166); A. 1001, *Petrus S. Pal. Lateran. comes* (Mittarelli, *App.*, n. 66, p. 161). Papencordt (p. 147) fitly compares the Count Palatine with the *Superista*. The Diss. VII. of Muratori gives us but scanty information concerning his office.

monasteries such as Farfa and S. Andrea on Soracte should pay taxes to the treasury of their protector; the existence, however, of domains of another character may be noticed.[1] When, in 874, the Emperor Lewis endowed the monastery of Casa Aurea, which he had recently founded, he presented it with all the revenues he possessed in the Romagna, in Spoleto, Camerino, and Tuscany.[2] If among these revenues fiscal rights are to be understood, it would prove how insignificant were the Imperial possessions in Rome and Roman territory. The amount of the revenues which the Emperor drew from the city is, however, unknown. In Carolingian times the gift of ten pounds of gold, one hundred pounds of silver, and ten fine pallia was yearly sent to the palace of Pavia, while the Imperial Missus was maintained at the expense of the Apostolic treasury.[3] No tribute from Rome is mentioned; only one-half of the fines, amounting in civil cases usually to ten pounds of

[1] *Libell. de Imp. Potest.* (p. 770): *erant denique monasteria in Sabinis—seu cetera fiscalia patrimonia intra Romanos fines ad usum imperialem.* In the Dipl. of Conrad II., A. 1027, for Farfa (*Reg. Farf.*, 707): *quidquid de praedicti monast. possessionibus fiscus noster sperare potuerit.* Among the Lombards the Fiscus was called the *curtis regia*, among the Carolingians *palatium*, for which, after the time of Lewis II., the word *camera* was sometimes used. As early as the beginning of saec. xi. we find *camera nostra* for the papal fiscus; the same expression is used for the imperial as early as the time of Otto I. Privileg. for Subiaco, A. 967: *medietatem in praedicto monasterio, et mediet. Kamere nostrae.*

[2] *Omnes res nostras, quas justo ac legali tenore acquisivimus, tam infra urbem Romam, quam extra—Chron. Casaur.*, p. 811. Murat., ii. 2; Papencordt, &c. (pp. 143, 144), hence infers the insignificance of the imperial domains.

[3] I take this from the *Libellus de Imp. Pot.*

gold, was paid to the Imperial Palatium. Owing to the numerous trials, these revenues amounted to no inconsiderable sum. They remained, however, variable, and other revenues also were of a like casual character, such, for instance, as the Foderum, the Parata, the Mansionaticum, the duty of maintaining horses and soldiers, of repairing roads and bridges, and of providing quarters for the army. Whenever the Emperor came to Rome his army and court were quartered upon the city, as is evident from the fact that Otto I. on one occasion removed his troops in order to spare Rome the expense of maintaining them. The duty of Foderum extended to all the cities of Italy, and proved no small burthen to the country.[1]

The Apostolic Camera.

The Apostolic Camera, on the other hand, was of an entirely different character. The papal treasury, originally the Vestiarium, was at this period equally called Palatium. The rents of the ecclesiastical estates, which in general were comprised as *dationes* (dazio in Italian), *tributa*, *servitia*, *functiones*, and *pensiones* were paid to the papal treasury. The separate names of these taxes were endless, and those of the tolls for bridges, roads, gates, meadows, woods, markets, rivers, harbours, &c., form a long list characteristic of the barbarous State economy of the age.[2] The officials exacted money from all the pos-

[1] *Fotrum* or *foderum* (fourrage, foraggio) : Murat., *Ant.*, ii. 1 ; *Diss.*, xix. 64. The *Vita Mathildis Reginae*, c. 21, says of Otto I. : *et totus pop. Roman. se sponte subjugavit ipsius dominatui, et sibi solvebant tributa, et post illum ceteris suis posteris.* Ekhard *Chron.* for the year 1073: *Anno Colonien. Episc. et Hermannus Babenbergensis Romam missi sunt pecuniam quae regi debebatur congregandi gratiam.*

[2] *Pontaticum*, *pedagium*, *portaticum*, *escaticum*, *terraticum*, *glanda-*

sessions of the Church, and in the city itself we find the papal Camera owner of taxes imposed on the banks of the river and the gates of the city and at the bridges.[1] We know nothing of direct tribute in Rome, and entirely doubt whether the free Romans paid poll tax or ground rent to the papal Fiscus. That Rome should not be oppressed by taxes was a principle of papal policy. Nevertheless, extortions were levied under the name of gifts, collections, tithes, and customs. Barbarous although the time may appear, it was yet not far removed from the later system of extortionate monarchies. The idea of sovereignty was mainly represented in the supreme judicial authority, and all the customary services of subjects rested on a pactum or agreement, by which tribute was paid on all of which the subjects made use as belonging to the State. Thus the Church could claim no more than the tax which, as Census, belonged to the Camera, and her essential revenues rested on her numerous patrimonies. On the other hand, fines and compositions fell to the papal Fiscus, as also the property of all who died without heirs.[2]

ticum, *herbaticum*, *casaticum*, *plateaticum*, *ripaticum*, *palifictura*, *navalia telonia*, *testaticum*, and so forth. *Diss.* xix. of Muratori. The *pensio* on leased property often amounted to only ten pounds a year; we may note at the same time the expression *ut persolvat pensionem in nostro palatio*, in the Diploma of John XIII. for Praeneste.

[1] *Lib. Diurn.*, c. 6, tit. 20, speaks of *actionaria de diversis portis hujus Romanae urbis*. The editor dates this formula (*securitas*) from the ix. or x. saec. Toll was levied at the Ponte Molle. Marini., n. 28: *pontem Molvium in integrum cum omni ejus ingressu et egressu et datione et tributu*, which Agapitus II. presented to the convent of S. Silvestro in Capite in 955.

[2] Marini, n. 42, Diploma of Benedict VIII. for Portus, A. 1018.

The Mint was, further, the exclusive prerogative of the papal palace, the Popes alone possessing the right of coinage.

Condition of the patrimonies.

The revenues of the Lateran had, however, greatly diminished. The restoration of the State of the Church by Otto I. had not put an end to the revolutions under which the papal property had suffered for more than seventy years. The patrimonies which had been so prosperous under Adrian I. and Leo III. had been exposed to innumerable sacks since the decline of the Empire. Boundless confusion reigned in the system of administration. The Lateran was frequently robbed and sacked, its archives were destroyed; the rectors of the patrimonies were left to themselves. The oppressed coloni no longer paid tribute. The noble tenants delayed the payment of rent or denied their liability. The Popes themselves were obliged to relinquish estates and taxes, and the German feudal system, which Rome had long resisted, made its way on every side. Numberless estates, alienated by cunning or force, became hereditary property, Popes lavishing them on the relatives or partisans to whom they owed the tiara. Necessity obliged them to part with many a fair domain for the sake of ready money, and, in order to preserve to the Camera the right of possession, to impose an annual tax, frequently of

He confirms to the Bishop *omnes res et facultates, mobiles et immobiles de illis hominibus qui sine herede et intestati ac subito praeoccupati juditio mortui fuerint*, and that in the whole of Portus, Trastevere, and the island in the Tiber (p. 67). The Castaldate of Portus was, that is to say, *ex jure Palatii Lateranensis*; it was ceded to the Bishop with all harbour and ship duties.

ridiculous insignificance. Wars, Hungarians and Saracens still further reduced the property of S. Peter. The greater part of the estates was ruined, and the Popes found themselves obliged to bestow entire districts on bishops and barons.

The exemptions also multiplied in the Roman territory. Ancient prerogatives were lavished with increasing frequency on bishops and abbots, who, as well as the nobles, seized possession of towns. We have seen this happen with regard to Portus and Subiaco, but it is still more remarkable that Gregory V. conferred the counties of Comacchio and Cesena, and even Ravenna itself, with its territory, all the public taxes and the right of coinage in perpetuity, on the Archbishop; and that Otto III. added to the gift the *podestas* or jurisdiction. The Popes thus renounced their rights over this long-guarded possession.[1] Abbots and bishops also made over their estates to powerful nobles, who then became their vassals or milites: in this way they were assured of having these lands protected against the Saracens and other enemies. In order that the towns might be fortified, or waste districts colonised, they bestowed these towns in fief, aud thus during the tenth century many fortresses and towers arose on the Roman Campagna. Although these contracts were always of the nature of Emphyteusis, under the influence of encroaching feudalism their character soon became altered, and as early as 977 we meet with a contract

The feudal system invades Roman territory.

[1] Ughelli, ii. 353, and Labbé, xi. 1011, *dat.* 4 *Kal. Maji*, in Gregory's second year. *Donamus tibi, tuaeque ecclesiae districtum Ravennatis urbis, ripam in integrum, monetam, teloneum, mercatum, muros et omnes portas civitatis.*

of feudal nature. John, Abbot of S. Andrea in Selci near Velletri, invested the celebrated Crescentius de Theodora with Castrum Vetus, with the significant duty of "making war and peace according to the command of the Pope and the abbot of the monastery." The more immediate conditions are also noteworthy. The monastery reserved to itself the right of manning a gate of the fortress; also the right of sending its consuls (judges) and its viscounts (overseers) into the districts it had leased, to guard its rights, to collect its taxes, and to decide in civil disputes, Crescentius reserving to himself the penal judicature and the command of the troops. The taxes took the form of a payment in kind, including a fourth of the vintage, and, on the festival of S. Andrew, the tribute of a pair of torches and of half a sextarius of oil. Although the treaty appears as a lease of the third class, the obligation of military service invests it with a feudal character.[1] This

[1] Lateran document in the *Collectan. Vatican.* of Galletti, ii. n. 8043 (the pages are unnumbered). It supplements Borgia's history of Velletri, which only quotes the Diploma of Demetrius Meliosi for saec. x. It is dated on April 8, *A. III. Benedicti VII. Ind. VI. Locatio et conductio—unum castrum sine aliquo tenimento quod dicitur vetus positum subtus strata—tali quid. condicione ut guerram et pacem faciat ad mandatum s. pontif. et praed. Abbatis et successorib. ipsius et ut ipsum castrum ad major. cultum perducere debeat. Porta que est a parte monasterii semper erit in potestate ecclesie et ut predictum jus eccl. non pereat ipse abbas vel successor ejus habebunt pro temp. consules vel vicecomes qui mittent bandum supra predictis rebus . . . bandum sanguinis et forfacture et offensionis strate et proibitiones litium et exercitus conducere et omnia alia ipse pred. Crescentius filii et nepotes ejus—possidere—debent.* It is signed by the abbot, five presbyters and monks, and five *nob. viri. Pandolfus Corvinus nob. vir. Adtinolfus nob. vir. Birardus Corvinus nob. vir. Bonus homo Coranus* (of Cori)

document is the first Roman deed of the kind with which we are acquainted; another document of the year 1000 shows us, however, that the system of beneficia was recognised by the Roman Church.

Sylvester II. conferred the town and comitatus of Terracina on the Lombard Dauferius and his family, upon whom he imposed the duty of military service, wherein lay the essential character of feudal vassalage. Such were the results of party strife and the raids of the Saracens. The ancient administration of the estates of the Church through sub-deacons became transformed into a system of private contract; this system passed into feudal tenure, and after the middle of the tenth century the great patrimony of S. Peter was occupied throughout by milites, who eagerly strove to transform into hereditary property the estates with which they had been merely temporarily invested.[1]

nob. vir. Amatus comes Signie. The remarkable diploma of 946, in which the Bishop of Velletri invests Demetrius, son of the Consul and Dux Meliosus, with a mountain and the surrounding territory, in order that he may build a fortress, is to be found in Borgia, p. 158. The *Canon* consisted, among other things, in the delivery of one-fourth of the wine produce, and of one out of every herd of cattle.

[1] Sylvester II. laments in his bill of enfeoffment (*praeceptionis pagina*): *R. Eccl. pontifices. nomine pensionis per certas indictiones haec et alia nonnulla attribuisse nonnullis indifferenter constat, cum lucris operam darent et sub parvissimo censu maximas res ecclesiae perderent* (Jaffé, *Reg.*, p. 346). As he says: *Concedimus sub nomine beneficii, et stipendia militaria sunt.* We have here a formal fief. Dauferius was descended from the Dukes of Gaeta; in 941 a Dauferius and his son, Lando of Gaeta, were invested with Traetto (Federici, p. 44).

4. OTTO III. GOES TO CAMPANIA—DEATH OF GREGORY V. IN FEBRUARY 999 — GERBERT — S. ROMUALD IN RAVENNA — GERBERT AS SYLVESTER II. — OTTO'S VISIONS OF A RESTORATION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE —HE ADOPTS THE FORMS OF THE BYZANTINE COURT —BOOK OF COURT CEREMONIAL—THE PATRICIUS.

We return to history. Otto left Rome for North Italy in the spring of 998. In November, however, he was again present in the city at a council, after which he immediately started for the south. His enthusiastic spirit had been stirred by the news of Adalbert's martyrdom; the promptings of the monk of Ravenna and the admonitions of S. Nilus had aroused his remorse for the cruel tortures inflicted on the Roman rebels. He therefore resolved on a pilgrimage to the sanctuaries of Southern Italy. If it be true that he quitted Rome barefooted, then is there ground for the rumour that he suffered remorse for his perfidy towards Crescentius; and although superstition had accustomed mankind to the sight of such acts of humiliation, abasement such as this must nevertheless have diminished the reverence felt for the Emperor by whom it was undergone.[1]

Weighty matters summoned Otto to the south. He here adjusted the relations between the Lombard princes, whom he held to their duty of vassalage. Capua, Benevento, Salerno, even Naples, rendered him obedience. His sojourn in Campania, where he had

[1] The doubtful sources for this statement are the *Vita S. Nili*, c. 91, and *Vita S. Romualdi*, c. 25, written by Peter Damiani.

visited Monte Casino in a spirit of deep reverence, was cut short by an important occurrence; the news reached him of the death of Gregory V. in Rome. The first German Pope had ended his earthly career in the beginning of February, and the suspicion that his death was due to poison seemed but too well founded.[1]

Otto resolved now to return to Rome; he first, however, made a pilgrimage to Mount Garganus, a wild headland in the Apulian Sea, where stood an ancient chapel dedicated to the archangel Michael. The worship of this Semitic guardian spirit had passed through Judaism down to the Christian mythology, and had made its way from Byzantium to the West. Legend related that the Archangel had appeared on Garganus in 493, where a church had been built in his honour within a cave. This church became the centre of the worship of the saint for the entire West. The fame of its sanctity, its remoteness, the solitary grandeur of its situation, made it the most frequented sanctuary of the age, so that Mount Garganus became to the West what Athos or Hagionoros was to the Christian East. The miracle-working Apulian shrine possessed a special attraction for Otto, being dedicated to the same Archangel Michael whose fortress in Rome he had besieged. Barefooted he climbed the sacred hill, and

[1] The *Vita Meinwerci Ep.*, c. 7 (about 1155), says: *Gregorius—post discessum ejus a Romanis expulsus, ac deinde veneno peremtus—4 Id. Martii moritur.* The *Vita S. Nili*, c. 91, seems to point to a second expulsion; it also says, ὥσπερ τις τύραννος βιαίως τῶν ἔνθεν ἀπήγετο. The epitaph gives the 18th February as the day of his death; Thietmar, iv. c. 27, the 4th February. The representation of the sarcophagus is given in Dionysius, xlvi.

clad in the robe of a penitent, lingered in the cave amid the chanting monks. And while thus mortifying body and soul he could turn his longing gaze from the lofty cape towards Hellas and the East. Advancing further, he also visited S. Nilus, who with other enthusiasts now dwelt in miserable tents in the neighbourhood of Gaeta. The Emperor fell at the feet of the saint, reverently conducted him to the chapel and there prayed in his company. In vain he invited Nilus to return with him to Rome, and offered to grant him any boon he desired. The patriarch's only wish was for the salvation of the Imperial youth. Otto laid his golden crown in the hands of the prophet, as a testimony to the nothingness of earthly grandeur, and a token that the true king was the saint who knew no temporal desire.[1]

Otto entered Rome in the last days of March. He found the city tranquil; the Romans had made no attempt to elect a Pope, but patiently awaited the successor to Gregory who should be given them by the Emperor. This was Gerbert, a member of the Imperial retinue, the Emperor's own tutor, and a genius who far outshone all his contemporaries.

This extraordinary man was of French, not German birth, a Burgundian of humble origin.[2] As monk in Gerbert.

[1] Εἶτα τὸν στέφανον κλίνας ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ εὐλογηθεὶς παρ' αὐτοῦ σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐπορεύετο τὴν ὁδόν.—*Vita S. Nili*, c. 93. Nevertheless, says his biographer, he did not escape the judgment of God, but died banished from Rome. S. Nilus came to Rome in 1002, and founded the monastery of Grotta Ferrata, the church of which was consecrated by John XIX. in 1024. Domenichino painted there the meeting of the Emperor and monk at Gaeta.

[2] For the circumstances of his life, see C. F. Hock, *Gerbert oder*

Aurillac he had devoted himself to mathematics, a science which then flourished owing to the impetus given to it by the Arabs. He had studied philosophy in Rheims with such success that he was afterwards honoured there as a teacher. He became acquainted with Otto I. in Italy, and the Emperor, attracted by his learning, took him into favour. Otto II. admired him, and presented him with the rich Abbey of Bobbio. Gerbert, however, soon escaped from the persecutions which he there suffered, and returned to Rheims; thence he went to the German court, where he successfully ingratiated himself with the Imperial family. After again dwelling for some time in Rheims, he rose in 991 to the archiepiscopal chair of this metropolitan city, owing to the favour of the new King, Hugh Capet, to whose son Robert he had been tutor. In his reports of the Synod, Gerbert had recorded the bold transactions of the schismatical French bishops at the Council which pronounced the deposition of his predecessor, Arnulf. Finally, compelled by the papal legate, Leo of S. Boniface, to renounce the throne of Rheims at the Synod of Mouson in 995, Gerbert went to Rome on affairs of the Pope. Otto had just received the crown. The young Emperor invited Gerbert to return with him to his court in Magdeburg; here he became the instructor of the Emperor in Greek and mathematics until 998, when Otto bestowed the archbishopric of Ravenna upon him.

Through the virtues of a saint, this celebrated city

Papst Sylvester II. und sein Jahrh., Vienna, 1837; Jules Havel, *Lettres de Gerbert* (983–997), Paris, 1889.

had now attained a fame equal to that of Cluny; for while the south of Italy was filled with the renown of S. Nilus, the north re-echoed with the name of a Ravennese. In 925, Romuald, a descendant of the Dukes of Traversara, after a wild career had become a hermit, had reformed the monastery of S. Apollinaris in Classe, and had afterwards retired to a hermitage in Venetia. A monastery for hermits which he founded on the island of Pereus, near Ravenna, in 971, henceforward became a celebrated seminary for anchorites. For unlike Odo, Romuald founded not monasteries but hermitages, which soon spread over Italy. A fresh wave of mystic enthusiasm swept over the human race at this period. The longing for the martyrdoms of antiquity was revived; the wealthy again bestowed their property on the Church; princes made pilgrimages and performed penances; the Doge Peter Urseolus, the noble Venetians Gradenigo and Maurocenus, became hermits like their master Romuald; and pious enthusiasts made their lonely dwellings on mountains, on the sea-coasts, and in woods and caves.[1] Romuald.

Romuald and Gerbert presented a singular contrast in Ravenna. The latter, intriguing and ambitious, a great scholar, an accomplished mathematician, might look with compassion on the hermit who was scarcely able to read the Psalter, and who strove to find the highest attainment of the human spirit in the waste

[1] Damianus, *Vita S. Romualdi*, and *Annal. Camald.*, tom. i. In Romuald the order of Camaldoli honours its founder; he is said to have died in 1027, at the age of 120 years. He and S. Nilus are characteristic figures of the tenth century, the age of the renaissance of martyrdom.

of mystic ignorance. The most renowned princes, however, sat at the feet of Romuald and humbly listened to his discourse; and the same Otto who, in admiration for the genius of his tutor, had written him letters addressed, "To the most wise Gerbert, crowned in the three classes of philosophy," fell prostrate before the ignorant hermit, reverently kissed his cowl, and stretched himself, a penitent, on his hard bed of rushes. Gerbert meanwhile had only retained the Archbishopric of Ravenna for a year, when fortune raised him to the sacred chair, and his pupil proved that the instruction of so great a teacher had not been thrown away.[1]

His appointment did honour to Otto, and reflected shame on the Roman clergy. The genius of the new Pope, who had formerly so severely criticised the ignorance of his predecessors, only caused the darkness of Rome to appear the denser. Gerbert was ordained in the beginning of April 999. He boldly took the name of the Pope who was revered as most holy, but who had already become mythical; Sylvester II. saw in Otto a second Constantine, and the choice of a name was not merely accidental, since friendship and gratitude united teacher and pupil. This ideal alliance between Papacy and Empire,

Sylvester II., Pope, A. 999–1003.

[1] Baron., A. 999, calls him *hominem alioqui astutum, et in gratiam se Principum insinuandi maximum artificem, tanta sede (ut libere fatear) indignissimum.* His artifices and his character have branded the "necromancer" with undeserved reproach; and the *Annal. Saxo* already says that he ought by right to be excluded from the list of Popes. Even Herm. Contr. (A. 1000) calls him *seculari litteraturae nimium deditus.* His verse on Rheims, Ravenna, and Rome is well known: *scandit ab R. Gerbertus ad R., post papa viget R.*

which Otto had striven to attain through his cousin, Gregory V., was now to be realised under the new Sylvester. Believers in the Donation of Constantine might well tell the Emperor that the name Sylvester pointed to the restoration of the ecclesiastical state and to fresh donations. The satire of the Romans, on the other hand, might have reminded Otto that immediately after the donation Constantine had resigned the Eternal City into the hands of the Pope, and had himself retired to a corner of Europe on the shore of the Bosphorus. Otto, on the contrary, desired to make Rome the Imperial residence, and to be the creator of a new universal monarchy. The ideal of Charles hovered before his eyes. The inexperienced youth was, however, incapable of conceiving any political system such as was necessary for the Germanic-Roman west. His Greek education had alienated him from the north; and instead of considering, as Charles had done, that Rome—fallen for ever politically—was merely the source of his Imperial majesty, the seat of the Church over which he ruled—instead of establishing the centre of the Empire in Germany, Otto desired to exalt Rome again into the seat of Imperial residence. The thought that it was first necessary to reduce the Roman Church, by a series of conflicts, to the level of a Patriarchate, such as the Church of Byzantium, never crossed his brain. The boundaries between Church and State were confused in his imagination, and with the despotic principles of Justinian, he united recollections of the institutions of the Roman Republic. The energy of Germany had saved the Papacy from

The ideal Empire of Otto III.

ruin, and had reconquered Rome; and the nobility, who, more practical than Otto himself, had sought to limit his dominion to the measure possessed by Alberic, the Emperor believed himself to have subdued. Having sent to the gallows the patriots who had striven to acquire a slight importance for the Eternal City, Otto to himself appeared like Augustus after the victory of Actium, and his extravagant imagination invested ruined Rome with the proportions of the universe. He dreamed of extending his rule as Caesar over foreign nations, and of restoring the Roman Empire. On one of his leaden seals Rome appears as a woman, veiled, bearing shield and lance, and surrounded by the inscription, *Renovatio Imperii Romani*.[1] With deliberate ostentation he revived the ancient idea of the Republic; he even spoke of increasing the power of the Roman people and of the Senate. He called himself by preference Emperor of the Romans, but also Consul of the Roman Senate and people; and had he lived longer he would have restored the Senate.[2] Although no document informs us, we can scarcely doubt that he gave some kind of civic constitution to the Romans. The power of the nobility had already become too great; the

[1] Muratori, *Antiq.*, v. 556.

[2] *Decretum de rescindendis injustis rerum ecclesiar. alienation.* (*Reg. Farf.*, n. 244, 20 Sept. 998): *Otto Dei grat. Romanor. IMP. AUG. COS. S.P.Q.R. Archiepiscopis, Abbatibus, Marchionibus, Comitibus et cunctis Judicibus in Hitaliam constitutis.* So I read it in the original Farfa MS., and expand not *Consulibus*, as Giesebrecht does, who believes that Otto had placed consuls at the head of a newly constituted senate, but *Consul Senatus Populique Romani.* The COS is written in majuscule, like IMP. AUG., and S.P.Q.R. in much smaller characters.

Emperor was forced to condone it. In a time when the rights of corporations assumed decided form, and the power of the sovereign was in nowise absolute, the city could not have remained without its own municipal constitution. The Emperor or Pope appointed the leaders, but the rights of the civic corporation were safely guaranteed by treaty.

He surrounds himself with Byzantine forms.

Otto now revived the pedantic forms of the Greek court. He bridged over the chasm which happily separated Rome from the despotism of the Byzantines, and, clothing himself in Eastern splendour, incurred the censure of his serious fellow-countrymen. The Emperor, says a German historian, desired to restore the obsolete customs of the Romans, and did many things which were differently judged. He was accustomed to sit alone at a semi-circular table, and on a throne higher than the seats of those around him.[1] Gerbert encouraged the Emperor's enthusiasm for all things Greek. Before his elevation to the Papacy, the Prince, athirst for knowledge, earnestly implored his tutor to instruct him in classic literature, and the courtier had answered that "He knew not by what divine secret it had come to pass that Otto, by birth a Greek, by Imperial power a Roman, claimed, as it were, by hereditary right the treasures of both Greek and Roman wisdom." The nature of the gifted youth was thus corrupted by flattery.[2] In

[1] Thietmar, *Chron.*, iv. 29; *Annal. Saxo A.* 1000.

[2] *Ep.* 153: *volumus vos Saxonicam rusticitatem abhorrere, sed Graeciscam nostram subtilitatem—provocare*, and now the answer.—*Ep.* 154: *ubi nescio quid divinum exprimitur, cum homo genere Graecus, Imperio Romanus quasi hereditario jure thesauros sibi Graecae ac Romanae repetit sapientiae.* And the *Praefat. ad Otton.*

order to win his favour the courtiers affected Greek manners, and, as in the eighteenth century, and even in the present day, French is stammered at every German court, so in the time of Otto German knights and heroes tried to stammer Greek; for so early is the date at which the pitiable passion of Germans, to falsify their own nature by the adoption of foreign superficialities, shows itself. Among the signatures of Otto's German judges we still discover the names of Siegfried and Walther written in Greek characters, in the same way as Latin sentences were written in Greek letters according to the fashion which prevailed in Rome and Ravenna during the Byzantine period.[1]

The book of formularies: *Graphia.*

Otto studied the ceremonial of the Byzantine court, with which he, the son of a Greek, wished to ally himself by marriage. Probably for his use, a Latin formulary was compiled, which is partly derived from the "Origines" of Isidore, and partly agrees with the Book of Ceremonies of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The Byzantine dignities are here described with antiquarian learning, and are applied to Rome,

Imp. in locum Porphyrii a se illustratum (Mabillon, *Vet. Annal.*, i. 122): *Ne sacrum palatium torpuisse putet Italia, et ne se solam jactet Graecia.*

[1] Thus at the foot of the Placitum of Pavia of Oct. 14, 1001: *Sigefredus Judex Palatii* CTГHΦPHΔOTC; and thus *Waltari* OTAΛΘAPT (Murat., *Ant. Esten.*, i. 126). In 1002 the Prefect of the city signs a legal document: CTEΦANO ΠPEΦEKTTOC OTPBH PO: ME. Underneath, however, simply and intelligibly, *Benedictus nobili viro; Balduinus nobili viro: MS. Vatican.*, 8043, of Galletti. Less surprising are such Greek signatures in Naples at this period; see the many documents of saec. x. in the *Monum. Regii Neapolitani. Archivii.*

and the fantastic vestments of the Emperor, the ten different crowns, are enumerated and explained. According to the statements of the unknown author, these were crowns of ivy, olive leaves, poplar branches, oak and laurel, the mitra of Janus, the Trojan Frigium of Paris, the Iron Crown (in token that Pompey, Julius, Octavian, and Trajan had conquered the world with the sword), the crown of peacock's feathers; lastly, the golden crown set with precious stones, which Diocletian had borrowed from the Persian kings, and on which ran the inscription, "*Roma caput mundi regit orbis frena rotundi.*" [1] Horses, weapons, musical instruments, even the eunuchs, are described; the various kinds of triumphs are distinguished. "No dignity, no power, no living soul in the Roman world, not even the exalted Monokrator, was permitted to ascend the Capitol of Saturn, the Head of the World, otherwise than in white raiment. The Sole Ruler must assume the white robe in the Mutatorium of Julius Caesar, and must advance to the Golden Capitol surrounded by all kinds of musicians, while receiving acclamations in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin from the bystanders. There all must bow three times to the earth before him, and entreat God, who has placed him at the head of the Roman world, to preserve his health." [2]

[1] *Graphia aureae Urb. Rom.* The legend *Roma caput mundi*, a customary phrase of that time, was since then borne by the coins of the Roman Senate. The iron crown is that of Lombardy; the silver crown of Aachen is wanting; the third one, of gold, is the Imperial. Concerning these three crowns, see Sigonius *de Regno*, vii. 288.

[2] Ozanam quotes in this connection an extract from *Const. Porphyr.*, i. app: *Ingressus Justiniani in urbem Constantin.*: ὑπήντησαν

Otto, however, was obliged to be satisfied with reading of this antique pageantry in the Book of Ceremonies. His fantastic whims contributed in great degree to nourish the vain ideas cherished by the Romans of the eternal capital of the world. Deluded enthusiasts might comfort themselves for the loss of their civic freedom by the thought that Hungary, Poland, the north of Spain, Germany itself, were provinces of Rome, that they themselves were proconsuls of these provinces. The ignorant aristocrats scarcely smiled over the youthful foibles of the Emperor, who flattered their national pride. They thronged eagerly forward to obtain the offices in the court and Militia offered them by Otto. If the Emperor did not create tribunes of the people, consuls, dictators and senators, nevertheless other officials with high sounding names were found at his court — Protovestiarii, Protoscriniarii, Logothetae, Archilogothetae, Protospatharii, as in Constantinople.

Prefect of the Fleet.

The new title of Prefect of the Fleet was borne by Gregory of Tusculum. In consequence of the decline of the ecclesiastical state the papal naval station at Ostia had ceased to exist, and Otto III., intending to create a Roman navy, hastened to further his purpose by the appointment of an admiral.[1]

δομεστικοί, πρωτίκτορες, αἱ ἑπτὰ σχολαί, καὶ μετ' αὐτοὺς τριβοῦνοι, καὶ κόμητες, πάντες μετὰ λευκῶν χλανιδίων. In the passage, *hebraice*, *grece*, *et latine fausta acclamantibus*, I recognise the continued existence of the Roman Jews as a Schola.

[1] *Reg. Farf.*, n. 470. Document concerning the Cella Minionis, December 16, 999: *Gerardo grā dei inclito comite atque imperiali militiae magistro; Gregorio excellent. viro qui de tusculana atque praefecto navali; Gregorio viro clar. qui miccinus atque vestrario*

More important was the order of Patricius, which, in order to flatter the Romans, he seems to have revived, for the title possessed a special significance for the people. It was a title occasionally borne by the Roman nobles, perhaps merely as a distinction bestowed by the first Otto, according to the example set by the Greek Emperor.[1] Otto III., however, invested it with a still higher importance—the solemn ceremonial of appointing a Patricius is mentioned by the *Graphia*. The Protospatharius and the Prefect lead the future Patricius to the Emperor. The candidate kisses the Emperor's feet, knees, and mouth; he further kisses all Romans present, who bid him welcome. The Emperor then appoints him his assistant, judge, and defender in matters belonging to the Church and the poor, invests him with the mantle, places a ring on the forefinger of his right hand, and sets a gold circlet on his head.[2] Ziazo is mentioned as the first Patricius of Otto's time;[3] but in the beginning of the eleventh century we find John "Patricius of the city of Rome," where in his

Patricius.

sacri palatii; Alberico filio gregorii atque imperialis Palatii magistro.

[1] To Fantuzzi, ii. 27, where, A. 967, a *dux Joh. consul et patritius* is mentioned, add the famous Roman deed of gift of 975 (Mittarelli, i. ap. 41, p. 97), signed *Benedictus patritius a Stefanus rogatus scripsi.*

[2] The well-known formula: *Qualiter patricius sit faciendus.*

[3] Ziazo (*Zacius*, *Zazus*) appears to be an Italian vulgarisation of a German name, for Azo is the German Albert. The brother of Count Frederick, resident near Halberstadt, was called Ciazo (Wilmanns, *Otto II.*, p. 19). Otto III. mentions *nostri fidelis dilecti et patricii Romanorum Zazi* in a document addressed to the Bishop of Vicenza, July 19, 1001, *act. inter Albanum et Aritium* (Böhmer, *Acta Imp. Selecta* 34).

own palace he holds a Placitum. Crescentius, Prefect of the city, stood by his side—the Patricius occupying, however, the foremost place.[1] There was a suggestion of rebellion in the office, which had a charm for the Romans, since the Roman magnates who had fought against papal and imperial authority had invariably called themselves Patricius. It was, therefore, afterwards obscured by the dignity of the Prefect, the importance of which office Otto III. seems also to have exalted. In the years 955 and 956 the City Prefect, who has remained out of sight during the Carolingian period, again appears. His position soon becomes more important, since we see him as the special representative of Imperial authority, invested with the eagle and sword, and exercising the penal jurisdiction in the city and its territory. At the same time he is the permanent advocate of the Church, endowed with judicial power.

Prefect of the City.

5. Beginning of Sylvester's Pontificate—Donation of Otto III.—Earliest presage of the Crusades—Hungary becomes a Province of the Roman Church—Otto III. on the Aventine—His Mysticism—He returns to Germany—Revisits Italy in the year 1000—Difficult Position of Sylvester II.—The Basilica of S. Adalbert on the Island in the Tiber.

The papal ideal of Sylvester II.

Sylvester II. meanwhile gave evidence of the spirit in which he meant to rule. He compelled

[1] *Reg. Farf.*, 649; Galletti, *del. Prim.*, xxvi.; Placitum of the year 1003. It is signed first by *Joh. Domini grat. Romanor. patricius*, and next by *Cresc. Dom. gr. Urbis prefectus*.

Robert, the French king, to annul an uncanonical marriage; he excommunicated the rebellious Lombard Arduin. The bishops were informed that the new Pope was resolved severely to punish simony and unchastity, in order that the episcopal office should again stand spotless above the authority of kings, which it as far outshone as the splendour of gold outshone common lead.[1] Sylvester found ready support from Otto in every matter concerning the furtherance of the ecclesiastical reforms planned by Gregory V. The Emperor was necessary to the Pope alike for the accomplishment of this noble aim and to uphold him in Rome. While Sylvester resolved to found a new temporal supremacy for the Papacy, he saw beside him a young Emperor eager for fame, intoxicated by the ideal of ancient splendour, and hopeful of inaugurating a new era in the Empire. The relationship of the worldly-wise master and his romantic pupil is, consequently, in the highest degree remarkable, for at bottom their ideas were at variance. Otto III. undoubtedly felt that he was Emperor, that he had made two Popes, and that he must follow in the path of his grandfather. He announced these principles when he graciously presented the Pope with eight counties claimed by the Church in the Romagna. He declared Rome the capital of the world, the Roman Church the Mother of Christianity, but asserted that, in squandering the ecclesiastical property for gold, the Popes had diminished her prestige. He further maintained that, in the con-

1 *Sermo Gerberti de informatione Episcoporum*, in Mabillon *Vet. Analecta*, ii. 217. The time of Gregory VII. is foreshadowed.

Otto III.'s donation to Sylvester II

fused state of the law, the Popes, in virtue of the fictitious Donation of Constantine, had usurped part of the Empire, and had invented an equally false Donation of Charles the Bald. He despised these fictions, but nevertheless presented his tutor, whom he had made Pope, with the counties of Pesaro, Fano, Sinigaglia, Ancona, Fossombrone, Cagli, Jesi and Osimo. This avowal, which was probably made at the instigation of earnest men, his chancellors, showed a consciousness of Imperial majesty which may well have struck Sylvester with dismay.[1]

The Pope avoided, however, disturbing the cherished dreams of the noble youth, for in raising his tutor to the Papacy, Otto hoped to find in him a pontiff who would further his ideas, and death alone prevented a bitter disillusion. Sylvester hoped to educate the young idealist, and under his rule entirely to restore the ecclesiastical state. He agreed to the project of making Rome the permanent imperial residence, since the Emperor's presence formed a safeguard against rebellion. He flattered Otto in every way. He was

[1] *Romam caput mundi profitemur*, in Duchesne, ii. 73, where the diploma is falsely called *Decretum Electionis Silvestri II.* Pagi and others dispute its authenticity. Muratori, Pertz, Giesebrecht, Gfrörer accept it. The principles of the diploma agree with the *Libell. de Imp. Potest.*; the squandering of their prerogatives by the Popes was censured by Sylvester himself in the feudal diploma of Terracina; their tone and character belong to the time. The gift of eight counties *vestrum ob amorem* is again mentioned by Otto in *Epist. Gerb.*, 158. These cities had hitherto been administered by Hugo of Tuscany together with Spoleto and Camerino. Like these the Romagna belonged to the Empire. The strong attack on the spuriousness of the Donation of Constantine is very striking, in Otto's mouth, in consideration of the time, although not impossible.

the universal monarch, to whom Italy and Germany, France and Slavonia yielded obedience, wiser than the Greeks, himself of Greek ancestry. By speeches such as these he inflamed the imagination of the youth who lay at the same time under the spell both of antiquity and monasticism.

Exalted by education above the level of his age, Sylvester nevertheless shared many of its characteristics. It is singular that the first summons issued to Christendom for the rescue of Jerusalem from the hands of the infidels came from him.[1] Church and State celebrated fresh triumphs, compensation for the loss of Bulgaria was found in the conversion of Sarmatia, Poland became Romanised, and the savage Hungarians, only a short time before the most ruthless spoilers of Italy, now restrained by German arms, submitted to the Roman faith and to German institutions both in Church and State. Anastasius, or Astarik, envoy of the shrewd prince, Stephen, appeared before Sylvester to receive for his master the royal dignity as a reward for the conversion of Hungary. The Pope joyfully placed a crown in the hands of the envoy. Otto, who hoped in the new sovereign to gain another vassel for the Empire, acquiesced in the transaction; but since the royal dignity was conferred through papal consecration in Rome, it appeared to the recipient to emanate from the power of the Church. The Pope, who already possessed the right of crowning the Emperor, for the

First summons to the Crusades issued to Christendom.

The crown of Hungary.

[1] Gerberti, *Ep.* 28: *Ex persona Hierusalem devastatae, universali ecclesiae. Enitere ergo miles Christi, esto signifer et compugnator, et quod armis nequis, consilii et opum auxilio subveni.*

first time invested a foreign prince with the diadem as a gift of Peter.[1] Henceforward the city gave shelter to peaceful Magyars, for whom Stephen built a pilgrim-house near S. Peter's. At the same time the King founded a seminary for Hungarian priests —an institution which was afterwards united with the German College. The first Hungarian King is still honoured in the church of S. Stefano degli Ungari, which occupies the site of the earlier house for pilgrims near S. Peter's. The Hungarian church, however, is S. Stefano in Piscinula, in the region Parione, where the ancient college dedicated to the Protomartyr Stephen must formerly have stood.

The conversion of Hungary was the result of the mission of Adalbert, whom Otto now began to idealise as his patron saint. In his devotion to the monastery on the Aventine where Adalbert had dwelt, he added to its property, and presented to it, as a covering for the altar, the mantle, embroidered with apocalyptic figures, which he had worn at his coronation.[2] He established his Imperial fortress in a neighbouring building, and dated some documents thence as from the "Palace beside the monastery."[3] None of the

Otto's Imperial fortress on the Palatine

[1] The crown, with which Stephen I. was crowned in 1001, is the same as that which the Hungarians carried off and hid in 1848, and which was afterwards discovered as a treasure. The diploma of Sylvester for Stephen is given in *Calles Annal. Austriae*, v. 299.

[2] The diploma of Otto III. for this monastery is given by Nerini; it has no date, but nevertheless appears genuine. 355 tiny gold bells in the form of pomegranates hung on the fringe of the coronation mantle, as on the mantle of the Jewish High-priest; it displayed a golden zodiac glittering with precious stones—*Graphia.*

[3] They are of Nov. 1, 1000, for Vercelli: *actum Romae in Palatio Monasterio* (*Mon. Hist. Patriae*, 1. 338, 339). The well-known read-

hills of Rome was more animated at this time than the now utterly deserted Aventine. Besides the convents of S. Maria and S. Bonifazio and the Imperial fortress, constantly filled with holy men and women and distinguished guests, there were several sumptuous palaces, and the air was considered peculiarly healthy.[1]

While Otto assumed the names of ancient Roman triumphators, such as Italicus, Saxonicus, and Romanus, he called himself at the same time servant of Jesus Christ and of the Apostles, and deemed the work of bringing prosperity to the Church of God as well as to the Empire and the Republic of the Roman people to be his highest mission.[2] Inspired by these ideas he sank from time to time into fits of mystic abstraction. Greece and Rome raised his spirit to the realm of the ideal, but monks ensnared and drew it back within the province of monastic faith. Thus the imaginative spirit of the Imperial youth wavered

Mystic tendencies of Otto III.

ing *in Palatio Montis* is to be rejected. As on other occasions documents were dated *in Palatio s. Petri* or *apud. s. P.*, so here was meant *in Pal. Monasterii*, but barbarously written *Palatio Monasterio.*

[1] *In Aventino monte, qui prae ceteris illius urbis montibus aedes decoras habet, et suae positionis culmen tollens aestivos fervores aurarum algore tolerabiles reddit, et habilem in se habitationem facit. Vita S. Odilionis* (*Acta S. Bened. VIII.*, i. 698).

[2] Diploma of May 7, 999, in which he presents Leo, Bishop of Vercelli, with this city and county, *cum omni publica potestate in perpetuum, ut libere et secure permanente Dei ecclesia, prosperetur nostrum imp. triumphet corona nostrae militiae propagetur potentia populi Romani et restitutatur respublica. Hist. Patr. Mon.*, i. cxciii. 325. A. diploma of Otto III. for S. Maria in Pomposa, A. 1001, *Ravenna V. Kal. Dec. Ind. XV.*, begins: *in nom s. et individuae Trinitatis Otto III. servus Apostolorum* (Federici, i. 148), like the preceding deed of gift to Sylvester.—*Otto III. servus Jesu Christi*, in Wilmanns, p. 138.

to and fro between the dreams of Caesarism and the renunciation of the penitent. He shut himself up for fourteen days in a hermit's cell at S. Clemente in Rome with Franco, the young Bishop of Worms, then went in the summer to Benevento, and again mortified the flesh in the monastery of S. Benedict at Subiaco.[1] He thence proceeded to Farfa, accompanied by the Pope, by Roman nobles, and by his favourite, Hugo of Tuscany. He desired to return to Germany, and while at Farfa apparently made provision for the administration of Italy during his absence, appointing Hugo his viceroy.[2] Saddened by the loss of his aunt Matilda, who in his absence had conducted the government in Germany with power and wisdom, troubled by the death of Franco in Rome, still grieving for Adalbert and Gregory V., Otto left the Eternal City in December 999. He was himself ill, and soon after suffered the further loss of his grandmother, the Empress Adelaide. The affairs of Germany demanded his presence: the dreaded year 1000 was at hand, and he had vowed a pilgrimage to Adalbert's grave. He took several Romans with him, the Patricius Ziazo and some cardinals, while Sylvester, filled with terror, remained behind in Rome. The Pope sent letters after Otto

Otto III leaves Rome at the end of 999.

[1] *Quandam speluncam juxta s. Clem. eccl. clam cunctis intraverunt —quatuordecim dies latuerunt.—Vita Burcardi*, c. 3. A diploma of Otto is dated 3 *Id. Aug.* 999 *actum Sublaci in S. Benedicto*, Murat., *Ant.*, v. 625.

[2] Privileg. for Farfa, 5 *Non. Octobr.* (999). *Qualiter nos quadam die Romam exeuntes pro restituenda Republica*—(Mabill., *Annal. Ben.*, iv. 694, App.). In *Ep. Gerb.*, 158, Otto calls Hugo expressly *nostrum legatum.*

imploring him to return. "I am filled with reverent love to thee," answered the Emperor, "but necessity compels me, and the air of Italy is hurtful to my health. I part from thee only in the body, in the spirit I am always with thee, and I leave the princes of Italy for thy defence."[1]

The conqueror of Crescentius, the restorer of the Papacy and of the Empire, was greeted by the people on the other side of the Alps with astonishment. From the festivals at Regensburg he hastened on to Gnesen. He founded there the Archbishopric of Poland, and proceeded on his journey to Aachen. Here in the crypt of the cathedral, Charles, the founder of the Roman Empire of the German nation, whom the young enthusiast aspired to resemble, sat entombed.[2] The sight of the remains of his great predecessor does not appear to have brought with it the consciousness that he himself had forsaken the path prescribed by Charles for the kings of Germany.

Otto was back in Italy in June. The thousandth year of the Christian era had begun, and the world, contrary to the superstitious expectation of mankind, had not perished. The eleventh century, on the contrary, was to prove fruitful of blessing rather than

[1] *Ep. Gerb.*, 158.

[2] *Chron. Novalicense*, iii. c. 33. According to this mythical account, Otto clothed the dead in a white mantle, had the tip of his nose replaced in gold, and took a tooth and a cross with him as amulets. The dead, however, appeared to Otto in a dream, and prophesied his speedy death. The legend that Charles the Great had been buried sitting on a golden throne, and was thus found as a mummy by Otto III., has been utterly refuted by Theod. Lindner in the *Preusz. Jahrb.*, 1873, xxxi. 431, and in *Forschung. zur Deutsch. Gesch.*, xix. 2, 1879, p. 181.

of ruin to mankind. While Otto spent the summer in Lombardy, the spirit of revolt again raised its head in Rome. The Sabina set the Pope at defiance. From Horta, whither he had gone to enforce the rights of the Church, a threatened insurrection compelled him hurriedly to fly to Rome.[1] He urgently entreated the young Emperor to return. Otto, informed by Gregory of Tusculum of the dangerous condition of affairs awaiting him, entered the city at the head of an army in October. He was accompanied by German bishops and by the Dukes Henry of Bavaria, Otto of Lower Lorraine, and Hugo of Tuscany. He took up his abode in his fortress on the Aventine, which he resolved to make his permanent dwelling. He caused the basilica which he had built in honour of S. Adalbert to be consecrated by the Bishop of Portus, to whose diocese the island in the Tiber belonged. He would gladly have erected temples to his canonised martyr all over the world, as Hadrian had erected them to his favourite Antinous. Otto founded churches to Adalbert's memory in Ravenna and Aachen, as well as in Rome, and the proximity of the island to the Aventine was probably the reason that induced him to choose the island as the seat of the worship of the saint. Adalbert had lived in the monastery on the Aventine, and from the fortress on the hill the young Emperor could gaze on the basilica below. The

Otto III. returns to Rome in October 1000.

Otto III. consecrates the Basilica of S. Adalbert on the island in the Tiber.

[1] Letter of Gerbert in Höfler, i. Suppl. xv. : *Sed que nobis apud ortam inter sacra missarum solempnia pervenerunt, non leviter accipienda censet.* Hock, c. 11, explains the letter quite wrongly. The subject is a rising in Horta; the Pope requires the Emperor to command obedience in the Sabina on his account *que nostri juris in sabino*, &c.

ruins of the Temple of Aesculapius still existed on the island, which in ancient times had been dedicated to the god; and from these ruins the church was now built. Aesculapius, the son of a god, received a successor in the canonised barbarian Woytech or Adalbert. Descending through the little garden of the monastery to the rush-grown bank of the river we still discern the remains of the travertine walls which once gave the island the form of a vessel; we still trace the image, carved in stone, of the serpent-wreathed staff, which reminds us that it was named in ancient times "*Insula serpentis Epidaurii*" from the sacred serpent from Epidaurus.[1]

Otto was at pains to provide valuable relics for the church of his saint. He demanded the body of the Apostle Bartholomew from the town of Benevento. Legend says, however, that the citizens deceived him, and sent him instead the bones of Paulinus of Nola, which Otto carried to Rome, and there interred as the remains of the Apostle. Afterwards, becoming aware of the pious fraud, he desired to avenge himself on Benevento, but his desire remained unfulfilled.[2]

[1] The *Graphia* says: *In insula templum Jovis et Aesculapii, corpus S. Bartholomei apostoli.* The island was called Lycaonia in the Middle Ages.

[2] *Leo of Ostia*, ii. c. 24. Martin Pol. and some catalogues of the Popes say that Otto II. brought the body of Bartholomew to Rome. Ricobald says that it was intended for Germany, but that, owing to the Emperor's death, it remained in Rome. Otto of Freising, however, relates that Otto III. conquered Benevento, and really brought S. Bartholomew to Rome. Benedict XIII. put an end to the dispute by granting Benevento the actual possession of the questionable relics. The *Eccl. s. Adalberti et Paulini in Insula Licaonia* is mentioned for the first time A. 1027: Marini, n. 46, p. 77; afterwards in 1049, *ibid.*, p. 85.

The church which he founded received and long retained the name of SS. Adalbert and Paulinus, but owing to his barbarian descent the Bohemian never became acclimatised in Rome, and it was merely owing to an act of imperial dictatorship that he was accepted even for a time in the worship of the city. The Romans soon let his memory die. They preferred to believe that the Apostle Bartholomew was actually buried within the basilica, and consequently named it after him. The name of Adalbert was not mentioned in the inscription (still preserved) which was placed by Paschalis II. over the entrance when he restored the church in 1113.[1]

This basilica is the sole monument of Otto III. in Rome. It has suffered many alterations; nevertheless the bell tower and the fourteen ancient granite columns in the nave still remain to us memorials of Otto's reign.

6. Tibur or Tivoli—Insurrection of this City—Besieged and spared by Otto III. and the Pope—Revolt in Rome—Otto's desperate position—His Speech to the Romans—His Flight from the City—His last Year—His Death on January 23, 1002.

On January 4, 1001, Otto welcomed his tutor Bernward, Bishop of Hildesheim, to the city, and accorded him a dwelling near his palace. The

[1] *Tertius istorum Rex transtulit Otto Piorum*
Corpora queis domus haec sic redimita viget.
Quae domus ista gerit si pignora noscere quaeris
Corpora Paulini sint, credas, Bartholomaei.

Emperor was himself soon afterwards called to take up arms to quell a revolt in Tibur. Among the most prominent towns of Roman territory were at this time Praeneste, Tusculum, and Tibur. Praeneste was a fief of the sons of the senatrix Stephania; Tusculum was ruled by the descendants of Alberic, but Tibur remained in possession of a certain municipal freedom. The little city was already known as Tibori or Tivori, whence arose the modern Tivoli.[1] Legend, history, and natural beauty have rendered it famous. Alba Longa had been the mother of Rome, and from her peperino hills the temples and walls of the republican city had been constructed; but the inhabitants of Tivoli could boast that the vast travertine buildings of imperial and papal Rome had arisen out of the yellow stone of their mountains.

The town of Tivoli.

Names illustrious in the time of Augustus are associated with the villas of Tivoli, among which those of Maecenas, Horace and Cicero, of Varus, Cassius and Brutus, of the Pisos, of Sallust and Martial, are pointed out.[2] The lovely gorges through which the roaring Anio rushes were adorned by fables of the Sirens and of Neptune, and the ruins of the temples on the heights bore the names of Hercules, of Vesta and of the Alban Sibyl, by whom the birth

[1] I find the first traces of this name in the *Cod. Sublac. Sessor.*, ccxvii. p. 29. *Judicatum de Turre una in Tiboris* (A. 911); we may notice how Italian names arose out of Latin genitives. A *Comes Adrianus* sat there as judge.

[2] They have been investigated by Antonio del Rè, a jurist of Tivoli (Graevius, *Thesaur.*, viii., which gives also the *Historia Tiburtina* of F. Martius).

of Christ had been revealed in a vision to Octavian. The ruins of Hadrian's villa, situated amid olive woods at the foot of the hill, still waken our wonder —the greatest pleasure house in the West. The ruins were at this time of such vast proportions that they were supposed to be the remains of a town, and were known as old Tivoli. Although countless statues, mosaics and costly marbles had already been removed, the number which remained in Otto III.'s days must still have been enormous. The Flora, the Fauns, the Centaurs, the Ceres, the Isis, the Harpocrates, Sosus' mosaic of doves, and the various other works which now fill the museums of Rome and other cities, must have lain in the ruins of splendid porticos, buried in dust and forgotten by mankind.[1] Goths, Lombards, and Saracens had sacked Tibur; nevertheless many ruins of walls and temples, the remains of the Claudian aqueduct, an amphitheatre, fountains, and here and there a statue, still remained erect; streets still bore the ancient names, and churches and convents had arisen out of temples. In the documents of Tivoli belonging to the tenth century we still discover the names *Forum*, *Vicus Patricii*, *Porta Major* and *Oscura*, *Posterula de Vesta*, *Porta Adriana*, *Castrum Vetus*, *Pons Lucanus*, where, like the tomb of Hadrian in Rome, the grave of the Plautii had been transformed into a *tête-de-pont*.[2]

[1] The first excavations in Hadrian's villa date from Alex. VI. and Leo X.; the beautiful works of art had consequently remained in oblivion for at least eleven centuries.

[2] The diploma of the fourth year of Benedict VII. (978), one of the most complete of the tenth century (Marini, *Papiri*, p. 229), describes the

Although papal overseers watched over the privileges of the Roman Church in Tivoli, as in Portus or Aricia, the citizens seemed to have preserved a spirit of independence. Their bishop had acquired exemption from the jurisdiction of the count, and since no noble families of importance are mentioned, it is probable that under episcopal protection Tivoli enjoyed a more independent municipal system than other Roman territories.[1] The privileges of exemption had relaxed the allegiance of the cities. These cities began to isolate themselves, and Rome soon found herself carried back to the days of her infancy, when, inspired by jealousy, she made war on the districts in the Campagna.

Rebellion of Tivoli and its subjugation by Otto III.

The Tivolese, mindful of their liberty, had slain the Dux Mazzolinus, who appears to have been sent as their rector by Otto. The Emperor hereupon surrounded the town. It defended itself, but soon lost courage, and was persuaded by Sylvester and Bernward to surrender. Half naked, a sword and a bundle of rods in the hands of each, the noblest of

bishopric of Tivoli. See also, p. 316, an instrument of 945, in which the *Fundi* of the church of Tivoli and its tenants are registered: Duces or Comites, Romans, but also Lombards and Franks, such as the Counts Annualdus, Gundipertus, Wassari, Grimo Dux, the Gastaldus Teudemar. In a donation of June 14, 1003 (*Cod. Sessor.*, ccxviii. n. 453), appear the villa of Hadrian, *civitas vetus, que vocatur Albula, non longe a civitate Tyburtina*, and the *Vicus Patritius*, the *Amphitheatrum*, &c. See the first edition of the *Regesto della chiesa di Tivoli*, by Luigi Bruzza, in *Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto*, Rome, 1880.

[1] *Et nulli comiti, aut Castaldio, aut alicui homini, qui ibidem publicas functiones fecerint liceat tuae Eccl. servos aut ancillas, sive liberos homines — ad placitum vel guadiam sine aliqua districtione provocare.—Dipl.* A. 978.

the citizens presented themselves before Otto to sue for grace. Otto pardoned the city, only razed a portion of the walls, and accepted hostages.[1] The Emperor thus showed that he regarded himself in every way as ruler of the Roman territory, for the Pope, the territorial lord of Tivoli, appeared simply as mediator to intercede for mercy towards the town, and thereby aroused the indignation of the Romans. We might doubt the vindictive hatred of the Romans towards Tivoli, were it not proved by history. Not only in this instance, but again in the year 1142, a like forbearance shown towards the little town became the cause of a great revolution. The self-respect of the Romans had been fanned by Otto's own enthusiasms. Already they dreamed of the restoration of the rights of the Senate, and claimed jurisdiction over the surrounding lands. The three pretenders to power — Pope, Emperor, and City — were thus brought into lasting conflict.

Indignation of the Romans against Otto III.

In the last days of Otto III. the Roman optimates were Imperialists; and since the Emperor desired to make his abode in Rome, they laid hold of his ideas of a new greatness for the Roman people, in order that they might replace the rule of the Pope by their own. The Emperor may perhaps have promised them the possessions of Tivoli; the Pope, however, in order to reserve the town for himself, prevented its destruction. The Romans now saw themselves deluded, and their hatred towards the Saxon yoke found in Tivoli a fitting opportunity to show itself.

[1] Tangmar (*Vita Bernwardi*, c. 23) was an eyewitness. Damian (*Vita S. Romualdi*, c. 23) ascribes the mediation to Romuald.

They rose in indignation, barred the gates, slew some Imperialists, and laid siege to the Aventine palace. After three days, the Emperor, who had been shut up within, resolved to force his way to his troops. Bishop Bernward administered the communion to his faithful adherents, and, with the Sacred Lance in his hand, resolved to head the sortie. Meanwhile the Dukes Henry and Hugo held parley with the Romans outside the gates, until they and Bernward succeeded in tranquillising the insurgents. The rebels withdrew from the Aventine, and allowed Henry and Hugo to enter the city; and the following day they returned peacefully to a council to which they had been summoned by Otto in front of the palace.[1] The Emperor addressed them from a tower. Pain and disillusion endowed the unfortunate youth with glowing eloquence. "Are you," he said, "the people whom I have called my Romans, for whose sake I have left my country and my relations? Out of love to you I have shed the blood of my Saxons and of all Germans, yea even mine own. I have led you to the remotest corners of our Empire, to places untrodden even by your fathers when they ruled the world. I would have borne your name and fame to the very ends of the earth. You were my favourite children; for you I have incurred the ill-will and jealousy of all the rest. And now in reward you desert your father. You have cruelly slaughtered my trusted friends, you have shut me myself out from among you; though this you could not wholly

Otto III. addresses the Romans.

[1] So the course of events is to be understood, according to Tangmar, *Annal. Saxo* and *Gesta Episcop. Camerac.*, i. c. 114.

do, since I cannot entirely banish from my heart those whom I have cherished with a father's love. I know the leaders of the revolt, and can distinguish with a glance those who endure without shame the looks of all men. And even those trusted followers, in whose innocence I rejoice, are condemned to stand still and unrecognised among the guilty. This is a truly disgraceful state of things." The speech made a great impression. All was silent, then a cry arose. The leaders of the rebellion, Benilo and another, were seized, dragged up the staircase of the tower, and thrown half dead at the Emperor's feet.[1]

Otto's dreams were cruelly dissipated; he fell into a deep melancholy. Like the Goth Theodoric in former days, he found himself in his beloved Rome a stranger amid strangers. Although the Romans laid down their arms, the city remained filled with tumult. The ungrateful Gregory of Tusculum stirred up the people. A plan of attacking the Emperor was discussed, for his scanty troops were in part encamped outside the city. Henry, Hugo, and Bernward besought him to save himself at once, and with them and the Pope the unfortunate Emperor left the city (February 16, 1001). His retreat resembled a flight, for several Germans remained

Otto escapes from Rome, Feb. 16, 1001.

[1] Tangmar heard the speech (c. 25). Otto's self-condemnation is confirmed by the *Gesta Ep. Camer.*, which, besides his dream of Rome's universal dominion, reproach him with too great familiarity with the Romans: similarly Sigbert, A. 1002, *Annal. Saxo*, names Gregory (of Tusculum) as the head of the revolt. His character is depicted in the *Vita S. Nili*, c. 82. *Gregorius—qui in tyrannide et iniquitate notissimus erat, nimium autem prudens et ingenii acrimonia excellens.*

behind, and were treated as hostages by the Romans. Rome was again independent, and Gregory of Tusculum, a grandson of the celebrated Alberic, whose house Otto had again exalted, assumed the government of the city.[1]

Otto turned northwards. He sent Bernward and Henry to Germany to collect fresh troops; he himself remained to celebrate Easter at the monastery of Classe near Ravenna. Although he might well have regarded his flight from Rome as the severest pilgrimage of his life, he, nevertheless, again adopted the dress of the penitent. Romuald extended an eager welcome to the wounded soul, whom he hoped to retain in his monastery. He had already succeeded in estranging a Doge from the world; he now hoped to achieve a greater triumph, and to exhibit an Emperor as monk. But although Otto's visionary nature might stray for a few weeks amid the mysteries of monasticism, it could not remain permanently buried in the life of contemplation. He soon laid aside the penitential dress. On a stolen visit to Venice, Peter Urseolus II., son of the Doge who had embraced the monastic life, showed him the splendour of the young Queen of the Sea, the results of his administrative virtues and the practical wisdom of his rule.

Breathing vengeance, Otto collected his army and

[1] *De porta cum paucis evasit:* Thietmar, iv. 30; *Annal. Saxo*, 1001; *Gesta Ep. Camer.* And Tangmar says: *immensis civium lacrimis*, which is naturally exaggerated. *Otto imperator Roma expulsus est*, say the *Annal. Colonienses* A. 1001, simply; and so too the *Vita S. Nili*, c. 92: στάσεως αὐτῷ γενομένης ἀνεχώρησε φεύγων. Sigbert, A. 1002: *per industriam Heinrici—et Hugonis—simulato pacto vix extractus, Roma decedit cum Sylvestro papa.*

He advances against Rome.

advanced against Rome. We do not, however, hear of any attack upon the city. On the 4th June we find the Emperor at S. Paul's; on the 19th July, in the Alban Mountains; on the 25th and 31st July, at Paterno.[1] It is scarcely credible that if the gates of Rome stood open to him, he did not enter the city. His army was insignificant. The expected reinforcements under Heribert, Archbishop of Cologne, had not yet arrived, and the Romans, who in fear had liberated the imprisoned Germans, would have preferred the direst extremities of a siege to a submission, which would have brought on them the fate of Crescentius. The Emperor soon appeared before the city, and soon laid waste the Campagna, which sheltered an enemy in every stronghold. He himself went to and fro between Rome and his headquarters at Paterno on Mount Soracte, near Civita Castellana, until the rebellious princes forced him to hasten to the south. He went to Salerno, and besieged and took Benevento. In the autumn, however, he was again in Pavia, whence he proceeded to Ravenna.[2] "If thou goest to Rome," Romuald here warned him, "thou wilt not again see Ravenna," and the saint spoke truth. Otto celebrated his last Christmas at Todi, where he held a council with the Pope upon the affairs of Germany.

[1] Giesebrecht, i. 801. A diploma of Otto for the Marchio Oldericus Manfredi is dated July 31, 1001, *actum paterne* (*Mon. Histor. Patr.*, i. 346). The documents from Paterno are given in Stumpf, 105.

[2] He was there in Nov. and Dec. His mood amid the whispering monks who surrounded him is well expressed by the words: *Otto tercius servus Apostolorum*, which are found in one of his diplomas *dat. X. Kal.* 1001 *Ravenna* (Muratori, *Ant.*, v. 523).

The year 1002 had already begun. Crushed by the news of the growing discontent of the German people, who threatened to crown another prince in place of the visionary enthusiast so long absent in Italy; disheartened by the delay of the auxiliaries, stricken with fever, the Emperor went in January to the fortress of Paterno, where Count Tammus, Bernward's brother, was in command, and where the Patricius Ziazo had joined him with troops from Pavia. To his fevered sight it seemed as if the whole of Italy were ablaze in one flame of rebellion; the monarch who had dreamed of restoring the universal Empire of the Romans found himself dying in an insignificant fortress, suffering from hunger and menaced by the insolence of his Roman vassals. He beheld Heribert approach with an army. Pope Sylvester gave him the communion, and he died in the arms of his friends on January 23, 1002, not yet twenty-two years old.

Death of Otto III., Jan. 23, 1002.

Otto's death, like his life, soon became the subject of legend. It was said that the widow of Crescentius, a new Medea, had ensnared him with her charms; that under the pretext of curing his illness she had wrapped him in the poisoned skin of a stag, had mixed him a poisoned drink, or had placed a poisoned ring on his finger, and had thus avenged her husband. When dying, the Emperor desired to be buried in Aachen. During his lifetime he had despised Germany; he returned to his ancestors in death. Otto's last days and his funeral progress through Italy form an impressive tragedy illustrative of the futility of the far-reaching aspirations of humanity,

His funeral progress through Italy.

such as not even the ancients have more finely described under the figure of Icarus. The Germans who accompanied the coffin, which enclosed the remains of the Emperor, hurried through Tuscany in rapid flight. His faithful adherents, the Bishops of Liége and Cologne, of Augsburg and Constance, Duke Otto of Lower Lorraine and other nobles, kept the Emperor's death a secret until their troops were assembled. Then they set forth. In serried ranks the brave Germans surrounded the mournful train, and opened a way for it with their swords. And thus amid fierce war-cries and through the swarm of Romans who crowded round his coffin, the Emperor who had so devotedly loved Rome was borne, a corpse, across the plains over which, filled by lofty enthusiasms, he had formerly ridden at the head of his army.

Otto III. is perhaps the most illustrious example history affords of a life sacrificed to enthusiasm for that beautiful southern land which has always exercised so irresistible a spell over the German imagination. Other nations of ancient and modern times have turned to foreign countries from political motives. Our only conquest has been Italy, the land of history, of beauty, of poetry, the land which itself has repeatedly summoned us. The intensity of the religious feeling of the Germans caused them to become the protectors of the Roman Church, and bound them with the bonds of necessity to Rome. The thirst for knowledge drove them to the treasure chambers of antiquity, and will ever render Italy and Rome dear to the German nation.

Political combinations created that conception of the Empire, the pillar of which was Germany. And for the sake of these universal forms, the Church and the Empire, forms which were to regulate and preserve the peace of nations, the nationality of the Germans themselves has become enfeebled. Century after century their kings have led them across the Alps to Rome to die for a political religious ideal. This fact, however, has made of Germany a chosen nation. Ever directed to the highest aims of humanity, Germany was enabled to become the centre of the spiritual activity which was to emancipate Europe. Through the influence of its Ottos, Germany established the continuity and current of the ages, broke the seals from the graves of antiquity, connected the civilisations of the Ancient and Christian worlds, wedded Roman to German character, thus forming a union whence issued the great development of modern culture—raised the Church from its state of utter decadence, and infused it with the spirit of reform. Germany let itself be drawn to Rome as by a spiritual magnet; but the descendants of those same Saxon kings who removed the centre of gravity of their national history to Rome, again effected the emancipation of Germany from Rome as soon as intellectual freedom commanded the separation.

Character of Otto III.

Otto III., although desirous of becoming a Greek or Roman, was, nevertheless, every inch a German. The very contradictions in his nature, derived equally from classic antiquity and from Christianity, were essentially German. The powers which then moved

the world—Germany, Rome, the East—moved his spirit at the same time; and the tenth century, which closed with him, foreshadowed, through him and his friend Gerbert, the revival of European learning under the influence of antiquity and the East. Neither the statesmanlike wisdom of Charles the Great, nor the heroic power of Otto I., can be demanded of a prince who ended his career at an age when kings entering upon a reign are not ripe for kingship, and the citizen is scarcely prepared for the simplest duties of life. The figure of this high-souled youth, filled with aspiration towards all that is great, belongs to the province rather of poetry than to that of history, on which he has left no important mark. His countrymen buried him in the cathedral of Charles the Great, and legend has celebrated him as a wonder of the world.[1]

[1] I quote only the following lines from the *planctus* or *Rhythmus de obitu Ottonis III.* (printed from a Munich MS. by Höfler, *D. Papste*, i. Suppl. xvi.):—

Plangat mundus, plangat Roma,
Lugeat ecclesia.
Sit nullum Romae canticum,
Ululet palatium.
Sub Caesaris absentia
Sunt turbata Saecula.

CHAPTER VII.

1. Barbarism of the Tenth Century—Superstition—Ignorance of the Roman Clergy—Invective of the Gallic Bishops—Remarkable Reply—Decay of Convents and Schools in Rome—Grammar—Traces of Theatrical Performances—The Popular Dialect—Utter Dearth of Literary Talent in Rome.

Want of culture in Rome.

We dedicate the last chapter of this book to the survey of intellectual culture in the tenth century, and shall close it with a glance at the outward aspect of the city. At scarcely any other period could the barbarism of Rome have been equally great, and since the causes of this barbarism are clear, we can scarcely be surprised at the results. In the age of the Borgias and the Medicis, moral corruption was veiled by an outward show of classic culture; the vices of the Church were hidden behind the tapestries of Raffaelle; but in the tenth century all show of outward beauty was unknown. The portrait of John XII. was as essentially different from that of his remote successor Alexander VI., as was the tenth from the fifteenth century. In the age of Charles the West, struggling to recover the possession of antique culture, was lighted by a gleam of learning

and of art. Poetry, painting and architecture were cultivated. Ancient works were diligently studied and transcribed in legible characters. On the fall of the Carolingian Empire, Saracens, Normans and Hungarians invaded the West; the Papacy became transformed into a Roman barony, and the Western world relapsed into barbarism.

Ignorance of the Roman clergy.

The ignorance which prevailed among the clergy throughout the whole of Italy was more especially conspicuous in Rome.[1] At Rheims the Gallic bishops declared that "there is no one at present in Rome who has studied the sciences, without a knowledge of which, as it is written, a man is incapable of being even a door-keeper. The ignorance of other priests is in some degree pardonable when compared with that of the Bishop of Rome. In the Bishop of Rome, however, ignorance is not to be endured, since he has to judge in matters of faith, mode of life and discipline, the clergy, and in short the universal Catholic Church." The Papacy defended itself from this attack through Leo, the Apostolic Legate and Abbot of S. Boniface, as follows:—"The representatives of S. Peter and his disciples will neither have Plato, Virgil nor Terence as their masters, nor the rest of the philosophic cattle, who, like the birds in the air, soar in haughty flight, like the fish of the sea disappear in the deep, and like sheep graze on the earth step by step. And therefore you say that those who are not fed with such poetry should never even be

[1] Read what Ratherius of Verona says of the Italian clergy in his Synodika to the bishops of his diocese, and the Council of Trosle in 909 (Labbé, xi. 731).

invested with the rank of door-keeper. I tell you, however, this assertion is a lie. Peter knew nothing of these things, and he was appointed door-keeper of heaven, and the Lord himself said to him: 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' His representatives and disciples are therefore instructed in Apostolic and evangelical teaching. They are not, however, adorned with the parade of eloquence, but with the sense and understanding of the word. It is written that God chooses the simple of the world to put to shame the mighty, and from the beginning of the world God has not chosen philosophers and orators, but the illiterate and unlearned."[1] Such was the bold avowal of the Papal Curia in the tenth century. The Church openly confessed her ignorance of humane learning and even her contempt for philosophy; she denied S. Paul, the learned doctor of the world, but pointed out how the ignorant fisherman Peter possessed the keys of heaven. The educated bishops of Gaul and Germany finally laid down their spiritual arms before the rock of Peter.

With the convents, where for a time the Benedictines had cultivated learning, schools also fell

[1] *Mon. Germ.*, v. c. 28, p. 673. The *Epistola Leonis Abbatis et Legati ad Hugonem et Robertum Reges—ibid.*, p. 686. *Et quia vicarii Petri et ejus discipuli nolunt habere magistrum Platonem, neque Virgilium, neque Terentium, neque ceteros pecudes philosophorum, qui volando superbe, ut avis aerem, et emergentes in profundum, ut pisces mare, et ut pecora gradientes terram descripserunt—et ab initio mundi non elegit deus oratores et philosophos, sed illiteratos et rusticos.* On the contrary Ratherius: *Quo aptius possum, quam Romae doceri? Quid enim de ecclesiasticis dogmatibus alicubi scitur, quod Romae ignoretur.* He says this because it was necessary for him to flatter Rome. *Itiner. Ratherii Romam euntis*, Edit. Ballerini, p. 440.

to decay. Even the school for choristers at the Lateran, which from the time of Gregory the Great may be regarded as the religious university of the city, must have sunk to the lowest depth, if indeed it still existed. The libraries mouldered to decay, the monks were scattered or worked no longer. If any possessed of literary tastes still remained, they were prevented from writing by the dearth of paper. For since Egypt, the ancient home of the papyrus, had fallen into the power of the Arabs, the scarcity of writing material had been keenly felt in Italy, and to this cause Muratori in part ascribes the intellectual barbarism of the tenth century. The production of manuscripts was exorbitantly dear;[1] consequently throughout Italy parchments already written on were utilised, the original contents having previously been erased in order that the parchment might serve a second time. To these palimpsests, unfortunately, we more frequently owe the loss than the preservation of the writers of antiquity. The ignorant monk destroyed the books of Livy, Cicero or Aristotle, and upon the leaves, from which he had erased the wisdom of antiquity, wrote antiphonaries or lives of the saints. The manuscripts of the past were thus transformed like its temples. The goddess who had inhabited a splendid pillared portico made way (Paganism having been expunged) for a martyr; the sublime ideas of

Manuscripts.

Palimpsests.

[1] The writers occasionally remark how much their materials had cost them. Thus in the *Regesta of Farfa*, below the miniature portrait which represents the writer in the act of offering his MS. to Mary, we read :—

Presbyteri Petri sunt haec primordia libri,
Soldos namque decem pro cartis optulit ipse.

Plato were wiped from the parchment and their place was usurped by the Canon of the Mass. Neither do we hear of libraries or copyists in Rome at a time when both in Germany and France infinite pains were expended on the collection of books.[1]

The learning of the clergy was limited to the study of the Creed, the Gospel and of the Epistles, if indeed they could either read or explain them. Mathematics, astronomy and physics gave no evidence of life. Classic culture was reduced to the scanty idea of "grammar." An age, the writings of which were nothing but a continued abuse of grammar, and whose very language arose from the complete dissolution of all laws that governed the Latin tongue, truly demanded no learning of a high order. Grammar was, however, still taught in Rome, and from time to time we encounter the title "Grammaticus," a title which had been borne by Leo VIII.[2] The insecurity of all prevailing conditions, party strife and revolutions prevented the success of any literary institution in Rome, if the

[1] *Ep. Gerberti*, 44. It is with interest that we follow the traces of the classics, such as Caesar, Suetonius, Homer, Boethius, Pliny, the Republic of Cicero (*Ep.* 87), which Gerbert took such pains to procure. These works were afterwards lost, and were discovered by Mai in a palimpsest of Bobbio, which had perhaps belonged to Gerbert when he was abbot of the monastery. Gerbert beautifully, and in a manner worthy of an ancient, says: *Causa tanti laboris contemtus maleficae fortunae, quem contemtum nobis non parit sola natura, sed elaborata doctrina. Ep.* 44.

[2] Leo VIII. was called *prudentiss. grammatice artis imbutus.* In Marini, n. xxiv., A. 906, a *Joh. Grammaticus.* In the *Chron. Farf.*, p. 462, about 930, *Demetrius grammaticus.* The title was so highly valued that even a Byzantine Emperor esteemed it an honour.

thought of any such institution were cherished. On the other hand, however, the survival of a Roman school of law is unquestionable, more especially in a period when the *lex Romana* obtained new lustre and the Roman judges received the code of Justinian with solemn ceremonial, in order to judge Rome, Trastevere, and the universe in accordance with its institutions. Although the *Graphia* describes this and other formalities of Otto's court with minuteness, and speaks of various court officials, it mentions neither doctors of law, scholars, nor grammarians. It speaks, however, of the theatre as of a pageant necessary to the court.

Theatres.

The passion for theatricals, formerly so predominant in Rome, began to revive during the Carolingian period in the guise of Christian festivals. Scenic plays, though condemned by the Church as works of the devil, had everywhere survived. Terence was studied wherever classic antiquity was cherished, and Roswita of Gandersheim wrote her Latin dramas or moralities on purpose that they might supplant the Pagan Terence in the hands of her nuns. The Vatican still preserves as a highly valued treasure a manuscript of Terence of the ninth century. Its miniature imitations of classic art represent scenes from the comedies of the poet; the name of its compiler (Hrodgarius) seems, however, to point to France as the country to which the manuscript owed its origin. It is a fact that plays were acted in Northern Italy in the tenth century; and at a time when so many Greek expressions were in vogue, the actors were called Thymelici. And thus, in an

age when the Greek tragedies themselves were forgotten, the Thymele of the stage of Sophocles lent its name to comedians. Atto of Vercelli complained of the sympathy shown by the clergy for theatrical representations. He counsels them to rise from table as soon as the Thymelici enter, and informs us that as at ancient banquets guests were always entertained with mimes; that plays were acted at marriage festivals; further, that such entertainments were in vogue, and were given more especially during the Easter octave.[1] As early as the ninth century the story of the Passion and other Biblical subjects were represented throughout Christendom at this season. Profane dramas also were acted on festival occasions. If such representations took place in Northern Italy, we may assume that they were also given in Rome. It is doubtful, however, whether comedies of Terence or Plautus were acted there, the immediate neighbourhood of the saints probably preventing these masterpieces being represented even as a luxury of the court in the palace of Otto III. Of games in the amphitheatre or of the chase of animals we hear nothing. Gladiators and venatores were merely remembered as antiquities. Mimes, singers, actors, and dancers, however, undoubtedly existed, and we may

[1] *Attonis Ep. Capitulare*, in d'Achery, *Spicil.*, i. 400: *Non oportet —clericos spectaculis aliquib., quae aut in nuptiis, aut in scenis exhibentur interesse sed antequam thymelici ingrediantur, surgere eos de convivio*; and (p. 410) *spectacula theatrorum* are spoken of: *maxime quia S. Paschi octavarium die populi ad circum magis quam ad ecclesias conveniunt.* Ratherius: *qui histriones quam sacerdotes, temelicos quam clericos—mimos carius amplectuntur quam monachos. Praeloquior.* v. 6, p. 143, Edit. Ballerini.

suppose that they appeared not in churches and palaces alone, but also occasionally acted in the Colosseum, or in the ruins of some theatre, as they do in the Arena at Verona, or in the Mausoleum of Augustus in Rome at the present day. The *Graphia* has dedicated two paragraphs to theatrical amusements; the only notice of the drama since the days of Cassiodorus. Poets, comedians, tragedians, scenery, orchestra, histriones, saltatores, and gladiators are enumerated, and the expression "thymelic" then actually current shows that the amusements here mentioned were something more than antiquarian recollections.[1] It is not too much to assert that mythological scenes were represented at the courts of Hugo, Marozia, and Alberic, and if John XII. drank to the health of Venus and Apollo in a boisterous freak, his imagination was at the time probably excited by some theatrical performances in the Lateran in which these Pagan deities had been represented.

With regard to classic literature the Romans always possessed the advantage of retaining the heritage of their ancient speech, and the further advantage of having a key to it in their vulgar tongue. While acquaintance with the ancients, both in France and Germany, remained exclusively the hard-won acquisition of the learned, a possession in which the people claimed no

[1] Paragraphs *de scena et orcistra; de offitiis scene.* The *Graphia* confuses present and past. When it says: *Comedi vanorum acta dictis aut gestis cantant, et virginum mores et meretricum in suis fabulis exprimunt. Thomelici in organis et liris exprimunt ad citharas. Thomelici stantes vero in orcistra, cantant super pulpitum quod temela vocatur,* we must understand something actually existing.

share, it cost Romans of the tenth century but little effort to understand the language of their ancestors, even when the sense of the words had become obscure. The writings and documents of the tenth century clearly show that the vulgar tongue had made a great stride towards the formation of the Italian language, and for the first time we find the "lingua volgare" spoken of in Rome as a distinct language side by side with Latin. The epitaph of Gregory V. extols him as having been able to instruct the people in three languages — German, Latin, and the vulgar tongue.[1] This was spoken even by the learned, and John XII., as a Roman noble, was apparently unable to express himself fluently in any language but the Italian. Although Latin remained the language of literature, religion, and jurisprudence, it disappeared from common use, and the few authors of the time laboriously struggled against the adoption of Italian, into which, owing to its close resemblance to Latin, their pens frequently strayed.[2] Precisely on this account, acquaintance with ancient authors was easy

The Italian language.

[1] *Usus Francisca, Vulgari, et voce Latina.* Francisca is Frankish, *i.e.*, German : *A cette époque Francia ne veut plus dire France. Quand l'Empire est transporté en Allemagne, la dénomination de France recule avec lui et repasse le Rhin.* Ampère, *Hist. Littér. de la France*, iii. 301. The *lingua volgare*, which was spoken by Gregory V., may besides have been the French vulgar tongue. A glossary of the vulgar tongue could be compiled from the diplomas of the tenth century. Articles and Italian terminations are established. Some terminations customary at this time have not been retained in High-Italian, such, for instance, as *bandora, arcora, fundora, censora, casora, ramora, domora*, although these forms are still found in Dante and Villani.

[2] The grammarian, Gunzo of Novara, derided by the monks of S. Gall on account of his mistakes in cases, excuses himself : *falso putavit*

to the Italians. And although Horace, Virgil, and Statius were no longer recited in the Forum of Trajan, they were still explained by the grammarians in their schools, miserable though these schools may have been.

After the revival of learning under the Carolingians, acquaintance with the ancient poets was esteemed a necessity of literary education, and the schools founded by the Carolingian princes in Italy cultivated a knowledge of classics. At the end of the tenth century a curious case, which made a sensation in Ravenna, shows the zeal with which the study of the ancients was occasionally cultivated. The Scholasticus Vilgard was so deeply enamoured of Virgil, Horace, and Juvenal, that these poets appeared to him in a dream and promised him immortality. He openly avowed that their teachings possessed the strength of articles of faith, and he was consequently summoned as a Pagan before the spiritual tribunal. These refined studies were diligently pursued in Germany. Otto I., it is true, spoke scarcely any Latin; his son and grandson, however, were thoroughly versed in ancient literature, and his brother, the Archbishop Bruno, a Saxon Maecenas, restored the palace schools of Charles, and even surrounded himself with Greek grammarians. Among Roman matrons Imiza, to whom Gerbert wrote various letters, appears as the sole instance of an educated woman of the time. Other Italian women of noble family were *literae*

Classic studies.

S. Galli monachus me remotum a scientia grammaticae artis, licet aliquando retarder usu nostrae vulgaris linguae, quae latinitati vicina est. Wattenbach, *Deutschl. Geschichtsq.*, p. 162.

nesciae, ignorant of writing, while in Germany, Hedwig of Swabia read Virgil and Horace with the monk Ekhard, and maidens of noble birth were unwillingly forced to study the—to them unintelligible—classics in the convent schools of Gandersheim and Quedlinburg. Although they remained ignorant of the geography and history of their native country, they were made acquainted through Virgil with the most fabulous districts of Italy. The German nun, Roswita, wrote Latin epics and dramas, and Adelaide, as well as Theophano, might have challenged comparison with the Lombard princess, Adalberga. Rome thus derived no advantage from her familiarity with the classic languages; on the contrary, in education Roman society remained behind that of either Germany or France. While Otto III. proposed to restore the Empire of the philosopher Marcus Aurelius, the Romans believed that the equestrian statue of this Emperor was that of a peasant who had taken a king unawares and made him a prisoner. And although fables may remain the peculiar possession of the uneducated, the muse of literature has nevertheless a perfect right to complain of the ignorance which prevailed in Rome, where, throughout the entire course of the tenth century, not one single name appears conspicuous for talent or literary attainments.[1]

Meanwhile foreigners like Ratherius of Verona, an errant native of Liége, who owed his learning to the

[1] To the beginning of the x. saec. belong the polemical writings of the followers of Formosus, which offer a more important contribution to the history of the Papacy of that time than to literature. In these writings, too, the continued influence of classic literature is evident.

monastic school of Laubes, or natives like Atto of Vercelli, the panegyrist of Berengar, and Liutprand of Cremona, rose to fame in Lombardy. Each of these men shows a pedantic erudition, and their writings, both in poetry and prose, are adorned with fragments from the classics—fragments which look as completely out of place as the remains of friezes and columns inserted in the churches and palaces of the Middle Ages. The same characteristics are found in Johannes Diaconus, the biographer of Gregory, and also in some Roman authors of the tenth century. They are also displayed in Otto III., by whom fragments of the Roman Empire, titles, vestments, ideas were eagerly adopted into the mediaeval state, where they appeared as a complete patchwork of the classics. The robe worn by the age was coarse in material, but adorned by antique trimmings and figures. The passion for ennobling a barbarous time with recollections of the past was universal. From the days of Charles onwards, passages from Virgil or Statius had been recited with enthusiasm, and the art of making verse was so common in the time of the panegyrist of Berengar, that in the opening of his poem the author makes an apology, saying that in those days there was no demand for poetry, since verses were written in the country as well as in the towns.[1] Meanwhile in Rome the sole evidences of poetry were found on gravestones, the doors of churches, or in tribunes, which as formerly were covered with couplets. Some of these verses were

[1] *Desine: nunc etiam nullus tua carmina curat;*
Haec faciunt urbi, haec quoque rure viri.

barbarous in the extreme, a few tolerable, as, for example, the epitaphs of the Crescentii. The striving after florid excess is everywhere evident; the turn of thought heavy and mystic as the time itself. The authors of these verses were probably laymen or grammarians rather than clerics.

2. SLOW RETURN OF LEARNING—GREGORY V.—GENIUS OF SYLVESTER II. A FOREIGNER IN ROME—BOETHIUS —ITALIAN HISTORICAL WRITING IN THE TENTH CENTURY — BENEDICT OF SORACTE—THE LIBELLUS ON THE IMPERIAL POWER IN THE CITY OF ROME — THE CATALOGUES OF THE POPES — THE LIFE OF S. ADALBERT.

The light of human culture, nevertheless, can never be entirely quenched. Neither the fall of the Roman Empire, the ravages of wandering barbarians, nor yet the first pious fury of Christendom, were able utterly to extinguish the sacred fire of Greece. Learning seems occasionally to flow in secret channels below the surface of history, coming to light unexpectedly in an apparently erratic manner, and, like a spring, quickening a succession of minds into life. When the intellectual work of Charles's age seemed to have perished under a fresh inroad of barbarism, Germany and England suddenly became centres of a new intellectual movement, and the reform of monasticism issued from France.

Odo of Cluny was not merely a saint such as Romuald, he was a scholar who had studied philosophy, grammar, music, and poetry at Rheims. In

Return of learning.

reforming Roman monasticism he must have furthered the restoration of ecclesiastical learning, for, since education and schools were in the hands of the monks, they must have shared the reform which overtook the order. It is true that we know nothing of any papal decree concerning convent or parish schools at this date, such as the decrees promulgated by Ratherius and Atto in Lombardy ; we may, however, assume that such were issued by the better Popes in the days of Alberic. Learning slowly returned to the Roman monasteries, and we have already seen a monastery on the Aventine distinguished as a centre round which pious monks gathered. These enthusiasts, with their title of " Simple " or " Silent," offered by their learning no contradiction to the audacious apology for ignorance which their Abbot Leo Simplex made on the score of Rome's divine rights. Their influence, nevertheless, contributed to the restoration of the more serious occupations on the part of the monks.

The terrible darkness in which Rome had lain had been already interrupted in the latter part of the tenth century. The succession of obscure Popes had come to an end, and a German and a Frenchman had swept away the barbarism which had so long prevailed at the Lateran. Had the cultivated Gregory V. been granted a longer and more tranquil reign, he would doubtless have directed his energies towards the reform of scientific learning. Sylvester II. would have been still more zealous in the same task.

Gerbert. Gerbert in Rome is like a solitary torch in the darkness of the night. The century of the

grossest ignorance closed strangely enough with the appearance of a renowned genius; and the eleventh was opened by the same Sylvester as by a prophet, foreseeing, as he did, the Crusades which were to follow. Rome, it is true, can merely claim the honour of having served, during some unquiet years, as the scene of his studies, which here met with no response. If the Romans noticed their aged Pope watching the stars from his observatory in a tower of the Lateran, or surrounded in his study by parchments and drawing geometrical figures, designing a sun-dial with his own hand, or studying astronomy on a globe covered with horse's skin, they probably believed him in league with the devil.[1] A second Ptolemy seemed to wear the tiara, and the figure of Sylvester II. marks a fresh period in the Middle Ages, that of the scholastics.

The knowledge of Greek philosophy—and the fact redounds to the honour of Rome—was acquired by the Pope through the medium of one of the last of the ancient Romans — that is to say, through

[1] Gerbert, *Ep.* 148: *Difficillimi operis incepimus Sphaeram, quae et torno jam exposita et artificiose equino corio obvoluta cum orizonte ac diversa coelorum pulchritudine insignitam* . . . thus to Remigius of Treves. He tells the monk Constantine how to make a globe (Mabill., *Vet. Annal.*, ii. 212), and the description of the globes is given in Richer, *Hist.*, iii. c. 50. Concerning Gerbert's literary activity and his letters, see the *Histoire Littér. de la France.*, vi., at the end; M. Büdinger, *Ueber Gerbert's wissenchaftl. und politische Stellung*, Cassel, 1851; Olleris, *Oeuvres de Gerbert pape sous le nom de Sylvestre II.*, Paris, 1867; Ed. de Barthélemy, *Gerbert, Étuae sur sa vie et ses ouvrages suivie de la traduction de ses lettres*, Paris, 1868; Carl Werner, *Gerbert von Aurillac, die Kirche und Wissenschaft seiner Zeit*, Vienna, 1878. The opinion that Gerbert had learned Arabic in Spain is devoid of all foundation.

Cult of Boethius.

Boethius. Boethius's translations of, and commentaries on, the works of Aristotle and Plato, as also his versions of the mathematicians Archimedes, Euclid, and Nicomachus, served to keep alive the fame of the Senator. In the tenth century Boethius shone as a star of the first magnitude. He was studied as eagerly as Terence or Virgil. His *Consolations* can be recognised as the model of the writings of Liutprand, who, like him, mingled verses with prose. Alfred the Great translated the works of Boethius into Anglo-Saxon, and commentaries upon them were later written by Thomas of Aquino. Gerbert himself united, like Boethius, a multitude of gifts and attainments. He honoured his teacher in a panegyric in verse, and it is curious to note that the writing of the poem was prompted by Otto III. The same Emperor who brought the ashes of Bartholomew from Benevento, who laid the relics of Adalbert in the basilica at Rome, erected a marble statue to the philosopher Boethius at Pavia, for which Gerbert apparently wrote some verses.[1]

[1] *Roma potens, dum jura suo declarat in orbe,*
Tu pater et patriae lumen Severine Boethi,
Consulis officio rerum disponis habenas,
Infundis lumen studiis, et cedere nescis
Graecorum ingeniis; sed mens divina coercet
Imperium mundi. Gladio bacchante Gothorum
Libertas Romana perit. Tu Consul et exsul
Insignes titulos praeclara morte relinquis.
Nunc decus Imperii, summas qui praegravat artes,
Tertius Otho sua dignum te judicat aula,
Aeternumque tui statuit monumenta laboris,
Et bene promeritum, meritis exornat honestis.
—*Praefat. de Cons. Phil.*, Amsterdam, 1668.

Italian annalists produced some works even in the tenth century, and the books written by Liutprand in North Italy are not devoid of life and spirit. Venice brought forth her earliest chronicle, the valuable work of the Deacon John, minister of Peter Urseolus II. The continuation of the history of Paulus Diaconus, known under the name of the *Chronicle of the Anonymous of Salerno*, was compiled in Campania. Even in Rome and its neighbourhood some historic records were collected, and Benedict of the monastery of S. Andrew in Flumine below Soracte wrote a chronicle during the time of the Ottos. The ignorant monk determined to compile a universal history, the first part of which he pieced together from various sources, such as Anastasius, Bede, Paulus Diaconus, and Eginhard, as well as some chroniclers of Germany and Italy. For times nearer his own, besides the continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis*, he made use of all the information that reached his ears; for he could have been an eye-witness of but comparatively few events. His information concerning contemporary occurrences is of doubtful value, and is frequently drawn from untrustworthy sources. Benedict's chronicle—a piece of barbarous patchwork—marks the lowest depth of decadence to which the tongue of Cicero could reach. Had the author but written Italian as he spoke it, the work would have formed a valuable monument of the *Lingua volgare* of the time. He wished, however, to write Latin, and consequently produced an absurdity. His chronicle is not, therefore, of the same use to the philologist who is

Benedict of Soracte.

studying the rise of the Italian language, as other writings, more especially other documents of the same time. The Latin language in this chronicle, and perhaps also in that of Andrew of Bergamo, reminds us of the rude ecclesiastical ornamental sculptures of the tenth and eleventh centuries, in which the natural outlines are set at naught in every leaf and every figure.

Book on the Imperial power.

Benedict made use of the tract of an Imperialist contemporary entitled, "Of the Imperial power in the City of Rome." This remarkable production glorifies the Imperium of the Carolingians, describes the nature of the Imperial power over Rome, and laments its decline through the coronation of Charles the Bald. The author falls into various errors when speaking of the condition of the city before the time of Charles the Great, and also awakens many doubts. The scrappy style of the production is barbarous; the language, however, is readable, and it is probable that the author was not a Roman, but a Lombard, writing either in the Imperial monastery of Farfa, or in the convent on Soracte, before the restoration of the Imperium by Otto I.[1] If written in Farfa, however, it was probably the solitary product of this utterly corrupt monastery in the tenth century, since it is only after the restoration of the order that we are able in the eleventh century to

[1] Pertz wrongly holds Benedict to be the author of the *Libellus de Imp. Potest. in urbe Roma* (*Mon. Germ.*, v.). The reasons which Wilmanns, *Jahrb.*, ii. 2, 238, adduces to the contrary are excellent. See the treatise of Jung, *Ueber den sogen. Libellus de imp. potestate*, *Forschungen zur Deutsch. Gesch.*, B. xiv. (1874); and that of Ferdin. Hirsch, *ibid.*, B. xx. p. 127 (1879).

extol the exertions of the Abbot Hugo, and the great activity of Gregory of Catina in the cause of literature.

Continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis.*

In Rome itself the invaluable *Liber Pontificalis*, which was interrupted at the life of Stephen V., was continued in the tenth century and indeed in the form of short tables, called catalogues. As there were no longer buildings or votive gifts to be described, these catalogues briefly give us the names, descent, and length of reigns of the Popes, and add some meagre accounts of isolated events. Nothing shows more clearly the barbarism of Rome in the tenth century than the continuation of the celebrated *Liber Pontificalis*, which now sinks back to the level of its first beginnings.[1]

The biography of S. Adalbert.

Soon after Adalbert's death, at Otto's desire a monk in the monastery of S. Bonifazio wrote the history of the saint. The Abbot, John Cannaparius, a Roman, is the supposed author of the little book; and the life of a Slavic Apostle is thus the most important literary work of the tenth century in Rome. The life is serviceable for the knowledge it affords of the time, the author having been acquainted with the most prominent persons of his age. He also shows himself to have been inspired by the ideas of Otto III. concerning the greatness of Rome. Like Johannes Diaconus in his life of Gregory, in his enthusiasm he soars at times into a

[1] These Catalogues of the Popes have been edited in part by Ekhard, Muratori, and Vignoli; they exist in various manuscripts. With John XII. begin somewhat fuller notices, lasting until Gregory VII. Giesebrecht, *Allgem. Monatschrift*, April 1852.

lofty flight. He does not possess, it is true, the knowledge of his predecessor; his language, however, although frequently disfigured by biblical phraseology, is not bad, and he rises far above the prolixity of S. Bruno of Querfurt, who in 1004 amplified this same biography.[1]

3. The Descriptions of the City—The *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln—Activity of Legend and Tradition in Rome—The Sounding Statues on the Capitol—The Legend of the Building of the Pantheon—The *Graphia* of the Golden City of Rome—The Memoria Julii Caesaris.

The description of the city.

A greater interest than these writings awakened was aroused by a species of literature which, although shared by other nations, was and remained the local production of Rome. We speak of the books of descriptions of the monuments, the holy places, and the great past of the city. When pilgrims visited Eternal Rome, their countrymen in the scholae of foreigners usually acted as their guides to the wonders of the ancient capital, where many of the creations of Christianity were already regarded as antiquities. The visitors, however, also found books of descriptions which served as brief guides. Some pilgrims, Franks or Germans, in whom the interest in antiquity awakened by Alcuin was still cultivated, began to look on Rome with the eye of the historian or antiquary, and made plans of the monuments of

[1] *Vita S. Adalberti Ep.*, and Brunoni's *Vita S. Adalberti*, in tom. vi. of the *Mon. Germ.*

the city which they took back to their northern homes. These accounts were the predecessors of the present guides to Rome, and as foreigners of every nation now explore the city, carrying their portly guide-books, so in the Middle Ages pilgrims were provided with their scanty memoranda inscribed on some leaves of parchment.

The twofold character of the city was reflected in these writings, since Ancient as well as Christian Rome was described. The groundwork was supplied for the former, by the *Notitia* and *Curiosum*; for the latter by catalogues of the stations, the cemeteries and basilicas, originally compiled for the use of pilgrims. To these lists were added the legends of saints, or of churches, traditions which brought Pagan and Christian Rome into connection with each other, and even notices of the court of both Pope and Emperor. Thus the *Graphia* and *Mirabilia* of the city of Rome gradually arose.

The topographical literature of the city, which has to-day swelled to the proportions of a library, began, as we have seen with the official lists of the regions. Of these we made use when writing of the fifth century. During a course of four hundred years we have encountered no fresh document of the kind, and not until the time of Charles the Great did new registers appear simultaneously with the revival of Rome and classic learning. Accounts of the churchyards and churches were compiled; inscriptions were collected, the collection of which bears the name of the *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln. In this monastery they were discovered by Mabillon, who afterwards

The *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln.

published them.[1] The compilation of this celebrated work belongs to the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century, before the building of the Leonine city. On two sheets and in two columns, the writer enumerates, without describing, the monuments, as they stand right and left of the streets as far as the gates, evidently making use of some plan of the city. He adds inscriptions copied from the monuments and churches. The work inaugurates the science of epigraphy, and this first little collection of ancient inscriptions, the work of an enlightened northern traveller, remained, until the beginning of the fifteenth century, the only work of the kind with which we are acquainted.[2] The ancient Regionarii occupied themselves exclusively with Pagan Rome, but the *Anonymous* enumerates both ancient and Christian buildings and thus places the city before us in the topographical outlines which it bore in the time of Charles the Great. As a scholar he speaks of the monuments under the names used in the *Notitia*; he scorns to employ Coliseus instead of Amphitheatrum, but never-

[1] In tom. iv. of the *Analecta*, best edited by Hänel in Seebode and Jahn, *Archiv für Phil. und Pädag.*, v. 125, and after that edition by Höfler, *D. Päpste*, i. 320; then by Ulrichs, *Cod. Topograph. Urb. R.*; and by H. Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum*, vol. ii. (1871). Regarding this collection, see De Rossi, *Inscript. Christ. Urbis Romae*, vol. ii. pars i., 1888, p. 9 f. He attributes it to the monastery of Reichenau. I have already quoted a little work of the time of Alcuin on the churches of Rome.

[2] We owe to the *Anon.* many elucidations: thus concerning the remains of the three temples on the Capitol, the inscription on the base of the Caballus Constantini, that on the Triumphal Arches of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, &c.

theless uses the popular word "Palatium" when speaking of some ruins which never formed part of any palace.[1] Likewise in the inscriptions he calls the Arch of Titus "*VII. Lucernarum*," as the people called it from the representation of the seven-branched candlestick. He also notes the greater number of the baths, the remains of which were still extensive; he speaks of Forum Romanum and Trajani by name, but is silent concerning all the other forums. He still beheld the Circus Flaminius, the Circus Maximus, and the Theatre of Pompeius; he quotes the inscription on the equestrian statue of Constantine on the Capitol, and mentions the Umbilicus Romae. He still walked through the colonnades of the Via Lata, still saw the Aqua Virgo and the Aqua Claudia, the Nymphaeum of Alexander, and the Septizonium with its names undestroyed. He recorded the ancient names of the gates and streets, and made an official list of the number of towers, battlements, exits and loopholes of the restored walls of Aurelian.[2] No trace of fable is perceptible. On the contrary, this dry register shows that its author was an experienced scholar, well acquainted with the *Notitia*. Besides the *Notitia*, there were also other official documents,

[1] *Palatium Pilati. Sca. Maria Major*; perhaps the remains of the Macellum of Livia near S. M. Maggiore, the ruins of which, on that spot, have considerably raised the level of the soil. The reader may remark how early Pilate figured in the popular imagination. The Casa Pilati, beside the Ponte Rotto, is well known at the present day. *Palatius neronis. aecclesia s. Petri ad vincula.* These are the remains of the Golden House of Nero, or the Baths of Titus.

[2] *Sunt simul turres* 383, *propugnacula* 7020, *posternae* 6 (*i.e.*, *posterulae*, doors), *necessariae* 106, *fenestrae majores forinsecus* 2066.

drawn up apparently by order of Pope Adrian or of Leo III., on which the author may have based his work. Plans of the city or topographical charts, on which it is possible that the principal streets and the most important monuments were marked, were perhaps already designed. Apart at least from the existence of such works we can scarcely understand how the valuable tables, engraved with the representations of Rome and Constantinople, which Charles the Great received apparently as gifts from the Pope and the Empress Irene, could have been prepared. In the absence of official documents of the kind, it would have been impossible either to acquire a knowledge of Rome or to describe it.

Legend and tradition.

Tradition, which fastens on monuments as soon as they become deserted, had already long woven its webs round the marvels of the city, and had brought many legends and names into vogue among the populace. The more distant grew antiquity, the more industrious were the Romans in veiling the Pagan monuments in fable, while legend was equally active with regard to the Christian churches. Owing to the twofold character of the city, tradition and legend—for both these muses of the populace are twin sisters—frequently produced a curious combination. Concerning the year 1000 many local traditions must have become fixed in the minds of the people, and we have therefore no hesitation in assigning the legends of the Marble Horses and of the Caballus of Marcus Aurelius to this period. Another fable may show that in the tenth century, and probably even earlier, many legends had arisen

which we find in the later *Mirabilia*. The *Anonymous* of Salerno, who wrote about the year 980, relates that the ancient Romans had erected seventy bronze statues in honour of different nations on the Capitol. Each statue bore the name of the nation it represented on its breast; each was provided with a bell at its neck, and day and night the priests kept watch in turn. When a province revolted, its representative moved, the bell sounded, and the priest gave notice to the Emperor. The historian, however, relates that these statues had been taken in olden times to Constantinople, that Alexander, son of the Emperor Basil, and brother of Leo the Wise, had them clothed in silk in order to do them honour, and that S. Peter had consequently appeared to him at night and had angrily announced: "I am the Prince of the Romans!" In the morning the Emperor was dead.[1]

The sounding statues on the Capitol.

[1] Alexander died in 915, *Anon. Salern.*, c. 133: *Nam septuaginta statuae, quae olim Romani in Capitolio consecrarunt in hon. omn. gentium, quae scripta nomina in pectore gentis, cujus imaginem tenebant, gestabant, et tintinnabulum uniuscuiusque statuerant*, &c. Preller (*Philologus*, i., i. 103) shows that Cosmas was already acquainted with the legend in the eighth century (Mai, *Spicil. Rom.*, ii. 221). It is known as *Salvatio Romae*. It was later brought into connection with Virgil. Even in ancient times there were books on the wonders of the world, as the chief of which the Capitol was esteemed. Besides *Cod. Vat.*, 1984 (saec. xi.), *Miraculum primum capitolium Mundi*, I refer to *Cod. Vat.*, 2037, fol. 170 (saec. xiii.): *Primum miraculum rome fuit sic. Erant ymagines rome tot numero quot sunt gentes*, &c. The legend is here related as in the *Mirabilia*, except that it has nothing to do with Agrippa. Both manuscripts, Bede, the *Graphia*, the *Mirabilia*, Martinus Polonus, refer to a book called *Miracula Mundi*, which was known to the *Anon.* of Salerno; it has, however, a peculiarity in the association with Byzantium, where the Greek source may be looked for. According to *Cod.* 2037, the seven wonders of the world were the Capitol, the Pharos of Alex-

The union of a Roman local tradition with the contemporary history of Byzantium is curious. The same legend, however, reappears in a description of Rome itself without any reference to Byzantium, and gives an explanation of the origin of the Pantheon.

Legend of the building of the Pantheon.

It runs as follows:—At the time when Agrippa, Prefect of the Roman Empire, having overcome Swabians, Saxons and other Western nations, returned to the city, the bell of the statue representing Persia, which stood in the Temple of Jupiter and of the Moneta on the Capitol, sounded to announce his arrival. The senators immediately appointed him to conduct the Persian war. Agrippa begged for a respite of three days. When on the third night he had fallen asleep, a woman appeared to him and spake: "Agrippa, what ailest thee? thou art in great distress." He answered: "Yea, lady." She said: "Be comforted. Promise me to build a temple as I shall direct, and I will tell thee whether thou wilt conquer." She showed him the form of a temple in a vision, and he asked: "Lady, who art thou?" She answered: "I am Cybele, the Mother of the gods: sacrifice to the Sea-god Neptune and he will help thee. Dedicate this temple to Neptune's honour and to mine, for we will both be with thee and thou shalt conquer." Agrippa related his vision to the Senate; he departed with a great fleet and five legions, conquered the Persians, and made them again tributary to the Romans. On his return he built the temple and dedicated it to the

andria, the Colossus of Rhodes, the flying Bellerophon in Smyrna, the Labyrinth of Crete, the Baths of Apollo, the Temple of Diana.

Mother of the Gods, to Neptune, and to all spirits, and gave it the name of Pantheon. He placed a gilt statue in honour of Cybele over the opening on the top of the temple, and covered the building with a wondrous roof of gilt bronze. Two bulls of the same metal also stood on the top of the temple.[1]

The *Graphia.*

Such is the account contained in the remarkable book known as the *Graphia aureae urbis Romae*, which succeeds the notices of Einsiedeln in this series of topographical literature. In the time of the Ottos, perhaps even as early as the days of Alberic, a new description of the city appeared, and, in harmony with the secularisation of Rome, concerned itself solely with the Pagan monuments, while at the same time books of notices respecting the stations and cemeteries existed for the use of the pilgrims. A scholar acquainted with antiquity enumerates the monuments of Rome, and adds some of the popular legends. He no longer adheres to the Regionary divisions of the *Notitia.* While the *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln held fast to the ancient names, the later author, on the contrary, occasionally makes use of the popular. The words Palatium, Templum, Theatrum, Circus lose their strict significance, for the

[1] *Graphia* and the *Mirabilia.* The Saxons indicate the time of the Ottos, the Suevi (Succini in the *Graphia*) that of the Hohenstaufens. The similarity of some phrases in the *Anon.* of Salerno shows that the chronicler had read some such *Graphia.* I believe that the legend arose after the Pantheon had been consecrated to Mary. It is said of Agrippa:—*Et dedicari eum fecit ad hon. Cybeles matris deor., et Neptuni, et omn. demonior., et imposuit templo nomen Pantheon.* The epitaph of Boniface IV. says:—*Delubra cunctorum fuerunt quae daemoniorum.*

populace at the time called all the great ruins of their temples and forums "Palatium," baths and circuses, as a rule, "Theatrum." A description of the city such as this, replacing or extending the ancient *Notitia* and the *Curiosum*, had perhaps been compiled before the tenth century. Benedict of Soracte must undoubtedly have been acquainted with this work, borrowing as he did the list of Roman towers and fortresses from some description of the city, undoubtedly the *Graphia* in its earliest form.[1] Under this title a description of the city became famous in the thirteenth century, and was quoted by the Milanese Galvaneus Flamma as a "very authentic" book. Long known in the Laurentian Library as a manuscript of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, it was not made use of, and was only printed in 1850.[2] It was subjected to various

[1] *Omnes tua moenia cum turris et pugnaculi sicuti modo repperitur.* He counts 381 towers, 46 castles, 6800 propugnacula, 15 gates. Adrian I. probably caused such an enumeration to be made. The *Graphia*: 362 *t.*, *c.* 48, *p.* 6900, 35 *portae*; the ancient breviaria have 37. The numbers vary but little in all the redactions of the *Mirabilia*, six manuscripts of which I have read at Florence. Although the registers of Imperial times were still employed, this fact does not exclude enumerations made under the Popes of Carolingian times, as Jordan ii. 156, asserts that it does in opposition to Nibby's and my own views. Whoever, like these Popes, restored the walls of Rome, must have had the gates and towers counted and entered in the official registers (of the Prefect). Had the papal geometers forgotten how to count? The Turres, Propugnacula, and *portae* of the Leonina were counted very well in later times.

[2] *Chronica, quae dicitur Graphia aureae urbis Romae, quae est liber valde authenticus, continens historias Romanor. antiquas.* Galvan. Flamma, *Manipulus florum*, c. 4 (Murat., xi. 540); in the *Docum. inéd.*, p. 84, of Ozanam, the editor of the *Graphia*. About the middle of the

revisions before it finally took the shape in which the Florentine manuscript shows it. The two extreme distinguishable limits of the period of its compilation are the era of the Ottos and the middle of the twelfth century, for it mentions the tomb of Pope Anastasius IV., who died in 1154. The paragraphs attached to it, relating to the court ceremonial and the appointment of the Patricius, Judex, and the Roman citizen, probably go back to the time of Otto II. or III. The title corresponds to the inscription "Aurea Roma" on the Imperial seals used in the time of Otto III.

Legend of the foundation of Rome.

The very nature of books of this class gives rise to additions, and the *Graphia* consequently contains portions belonging to different times. It opens with the legend of the foundation by Noah of a city near Rome, which bore the name of the founder, and relates that his sons Janus, Japhet, and Camese built the town of Janiculum on the Palatine, and the palace Janiculum in Trastevere.[1] Janus dwelt on the Palatine, and, aided by Nimrod or Saturn, who had been emasculated by his son Jupiter, built the

fourteenth century the *Graphia* was read in Rome, and was made use of by Johannes Caballini de Cerronibus, who says in his *Polistoria*: *Graphia aureae urbis Romae stante in ecclesia S. M. Nove de urbe, quam vidi et jugiter legi* (Urlich's *Cod. Urb. Romae Topographicus*, p. 139). The title *Aurea Roma* is common on Imperial leaden seals after the time of Otto III. Muratori, *Ant.*, i. 385: Otto's portrait, round it AUREA ROMA; reverse: ODDO IMPERATOR ROMANOR.

[1] *Ubi nunc ecclesia S. Johannis ad Janiculum.* According to Panvinius, S. Giovanni di Malva in Trastevere was formerly called *S. Joh. in Mica Aurea.* I have met with it under this name in saec. xiv., but it is not known to me as such in saec. x.

city of Saturnia on the Capitol.[1] King Italus, with the Syracusans, founded on the River Albula or Tibris a city of the same name; other kings—Hemiles, Tiberis, Evander, Coriba, Glaucus, Aeneas, Aventinus—built other cities, until finally, on April 17, 433 years after the fall of Troy, Romulus surrounded all these towns by a wall and called them Rome, and not only all Italians but almost all the nobility of the whole earth with their wives and children flocked to this new city.[2] The association of the Noah of Old Testament history with the foundation of Rome is a proof of the faculty for combination possessed by tradition. It is, however impossible to discover the date at which this legend arose. Later, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, fables recording the origin of the city were related at length in various books, and thus arose the *Liber Imperialis*, the *Romuleon*, the *Fiorità d'Italia*, the *Historia Trajana et Romana*. These

[1] According to recent investigators the primitive legend of Saturn explains the name and foundation of the city of Rome. Remus or Romus is, according to them, a Semitic name of Saturn ("the Highest"), and appears in the Syrian forms Ab-Ram, Abu-Rom, Baal-Ram. Julius Braun, *Naturgeschichte der Sage*, on the names in question, and his essay "Rom" in *Historische Landschaften*, Stuttgart, 1867. On the other hand, Corssen (compare *Zeitschr. für Sprachf.*, x. 18, 19), with more simplicity and success, has sought to derive the name of Rome from the original name of the Tiber, Rumon, which signifies river. J. Guidi, in "Roma nei geografi arabi" (*Archiv. d. Soc. Rom.*, i. p. 189 ff.), has recently attempted to confirm this view.

[2] The *Mirabilia* do not contain this legend, which was known in part to Galv. Flamma. The *Hist. Miscella* begins: *primus in Italia ut quibusd. placet regnavit Janus, deinde Saturnus*, &c. In the twelfth century Catalogues of the Kings, Consuls, and Emperors, beginning with Saturn and other mythical names, were very popular. One of

legends flourished more particularly at the time when Italian cities began to attain civic independence and each town desired the ornament of an ancient pedigree.[1]

Legend concerning the tomb of Julius Caesar.

Among the legends contained in the *Graphia*, one of the earliest is undoubtedly that of the burial of Julius Caesar. It was currently reported among the people that his ashes reposed in the golden ball at the summit of the Vatican obelisk; that this ball, to which no spoiler had reached, was set with precious stones and bore the inscription:—

> Caesar, thou wert so great as was the world;
> Now thou art hidden in a petty grave.

It was said that Caesar had been buried at this lofty height in order that the world should remain subject to the dead ruler as it had been subject to the living. The obelisk was therefore called *Memoria* or *Sepulcrum Caesaris*, as the mausoleum of Hadrian was called *Memoria*. The latter expression is specially significant in Rome, where everything belonged to memory and the past. The obelisk is thus designated in a bull of Leo IX. of the year

these genealogies is given in *Cod.* 257 of Monte Casino, which begins: *Saturnus Uranius imperator gentis trojanae. Saturnus X. Abraham nascitur . . . Ytaliam ubique peragravit . . . yserniam condidit.* But here Janus only comes after Priam. *Hic janyculum condidit.* This legend passed into other descriptions of the city; I have read it in a distorted form in a *Cod. Magliab.* (sheets 10, 31, cart. 134–137), which was compiled from the *Graphia* and *Mirabilia*, but which does not give the fable of Noah. In the Middle Ages a monument in the Forum of Nerva was called Noah's Ark.

[1] It is well known that the Franks traced their origin from Troy. This is already told us by Fredegar, who is referred to by Paulus Diaconus, *Gesta Ep. Mett.* (*Mon. Germ.*, ii. 264).

1053, where it is also called Agulia, a name which it still retains in Italian. It is possible that in the mouth of the people the word Agulia may have been early corrupted into Juglia, and that the latter name may have given rise to the legend concerning the great Caesar, so that a myth may have thus developed from a word. This is rendered the more probable by the circumstance that the base of the monument bore the inscription *Divo Caesari*.[1]

Among the local traditions given in the *Graphia* or *Mirabilia*, there is scarcely one, not even the legend of the Sibyl and Octavian, which had not arisen earlier than the year 1000. We prefer, however, to introduce these legends where opportunity seems most fitting.[2]

[1] *Caesar tantus eras, quantus et orbis ;*
Sed nunc in modico clauderis antro.

The same lines are found in the epitaph of Henry III. (who died in 1056) only with the variant : *at nunc exigua clauderis urna.* The same thought appears in the epitaph of the celebrated Crescentius, and in that of another Crescentius in 1028 : *hoc jacet in parvo magnus Crescentius antro.* Bull of Leo. IX. (*Bullar. Vat.*, i. 25) : *via quae venit ab Agulia, quae vocatur Sepulcrum Julii Caesaris.* The *Lib. Imperialis* of Giov. Bonsignari (Magliabech, xxiii. Cod. ix.) says : *la* (the cinerary-urn) *puosono in sur un alta pietra che oggi si chiama la ghuglia di s. Pietro.* The Tuscans, he observes, say, *aghuglia*, from which *Julia* arose. Signorili says : *la Guglia—in cujus summitate est vas aereum ubi sunt cineres corporis Octaviani*, in De Rossi, *Le prime raccolte*, p. 78. See also A. Graf, *Roma nella memoria del med. evo*, i. 292 f. When Sixtus V. had the obelisk removed, it was found that the ball was of plaster, and was solid. Fea, *sull. Rov.*, p. 345, note. Plans of the city in the fifteenth century mark a monument resembling an obelisk in the district of Minerva, as the *sepulcrum Bruti*.

[2] The *Graphia* and the *Mirabilia*, which end after the middle of saec. 12, are, as far as the monuments are concerned, recensions, agreeing

4. The Regions of the City in the Tenth Century—The Streets—Architecture—Description of a Palace—Great Number of Imposing Ruins—Devastation of Rome by the Romans.

Regions of the city in the tenth century.

We have endeavoured to piece together a slight account of Rome as it existed in the tenth century, not from these fabulous histories, but from some contemporary documents. But being as we are without a guide through this labyrinthine city, our account can be no more systematic than the description of the *Mirabilia*. We attempted to depict mediaeval Rome in accordance with the regionary divisions, but the forthcoming documents proved incomplete. It is singular that while the seven ecclesiastical divisions have disappeared from sight, a civic division still remains perceptible. The division of the regions must, however, have been altered at different periods, and now no longer corresponded to the division of Augustus. As early as the tenth and eleventh centuries the actual city numbered twelve regions, Trastevere apparently forming a thirteenth. They were designated by number, while each also had its individual name. Each stood under a captain or overseer, and we have already encountered these twelve or thirteen leaders of the civic companies

almost word for word, of one and the same description of the city. The additions of the *Graphia* have perhaps been derived from elsewhere, and united in the MS. of Florence. Ozanam has already shown that the *Graphia* is older than the *Mirabilia*, although (on account of the added fragments) he has wrongly attributed it to the Byzantine time. Giesebrecht also (vol. i. at the end) has dealt with it in detail.

under the doubtful name of *decarcones*, in the year 966, as influential leaders of the Roman people.[1]

Of the twelve regions of this period we have not been able to determine the position of the tenth and eleventh.[2]

The first region embraced the Aventine, and stretched across the Marmorata and Ripa Graeca to the river. From the ancient granaries situated within it, it was, and is still, called Horrea.[3]

The second region included the Coelian and a part of the Palatine as far as the Aventine. The Quattro Coronati, the Forma Claudia, Circus Maximus, Septizonium, Porta Metrovia or Metrobi, in front of which lay the marshy tracts of the *Prata Decii* or *Decenniae* are cited within it.[4]

[1] As this name is only found in one passage of the *Vita Joh. XIII.*, Adinolfi (*Roma nell' età di mezzo*, i. 165) is entirely arbitrary in speaking of a *decarconale* regionary division.

[2] To my list of the mediaeval regions, which for the first time threw some light on this topographical question, Jordan, *Topogr. der Stadt Rom.*, has made some additions (vol. ii. 315 ff.). His efforts to prove that the Augustan division of regions endured until "about" the twelfth century are, however, by no means successful. It can only be maintained that some of the old ordinal numbers of the regions were traditionally preserved in the Middle Ages.

[3] Mittarelli, n. 121, p. 273 (A. 1025), and n. 122: *Regione prima, quae appellatur Orrea.* In the Privil. Joh. X. for Subiaco, of Jan. 18, 926 (*Reg. Sublacense Doc.* 9), is mentioned an *oratorium S. Gemiliani cum suis pertinentiis positis in prima regione super Tiberim*, and further, *in prima regione in ripa graeca juxta marmoratam.* I observe that as early as the time of Gregory I. (about 591) the Aventine was included in the first region: *in regione prima ante gradus S. Sabinae Reg. Greg.*, ii. 10, Jaffé, 2 Ed., n. 1160, p. 151. In this passage of Gregory, however, the first region is not the ecclesiastical region, since it does not correspond with the latter in the Gregorian penitential procession.

[4] The Privileg. of John X. quoted above: *in secunda reg. urbis juxta ecc. IV. coronator.*, and *juxta formam claudiam* and *portam*

The third region is marked by the Porta Maggiore, Santa Croce, the Claudia (which intersected two regions), the Merulana, the convents of S. Vito and S. Lucia Renati, S. Pastor, and the Arcus Pietatis. It therefore embraced districts which belonged to the fifth Augustan region—*Esquiliae*.[1]

The fourth is marked by the Campus S. Agathae in an isolated document. It was possibly bounded by S. Agatha in Subura in the seventh region, and included the Quirinal and Viminal.[2]

In the fifth region lay a part of the Field of Mars, which contained the mausoleum of Augustus, the

majorem. The same document quotes S. Erasmus in this region, and Docum. 24, S. Stephan. Marini, n. 102, p. 160, A. 961, has the convent *S. Petri et Martini in regione secunda sub Aventino in loco qui dicitur Orrea*, which can only be a mistake of the notary. *Reg. Sublac.*, p. 134, A. 953 : *terrae positae Regione* 2. *juxta decennias*, and *campus qui vocatur Decennias* ; further, *prata Decii—foris porta Metrobi.* The name of this gate, from which no road started, is unexplained. It is thus named as early as A. 866. *Reg. Subl.*, p. 127. Concerning the *Metrovia*, see Tomassetti, "Campagna Romana," *Arch. d. Soc. Rome*, viii. (1885), p. 9 ff.

[1] Galletti, *Prim.*, n. 8, p. 195, A. 924 : *regio* 3, *juxta porta Majore* ; it was also the boundary of region 2. A church to S. Theodore stood there ; *ab uno latere forma claudia, et a sec. lat. ortu de Mercurio. Regione tertia non longe da Hierusalem* (n. 9, p. 196, A. 929). A Massa Juliana in the time of Bened. VI. in regio 3 (Murat, *Ant.*, v. 774 D.). Mittarelli, p. 197, App., A. 1011 : *regione tertia, in locum qui vocatur S. Pastore, sive arcum Pietatis.*

[2] *Reg. Sublac. Doc.*, 79 A. 976 : *regione quarta in locum qui appellatur Campum S. Agathe.* The region there was called *Caballi Marmorei : Ortum cum Casalino in Regione Caballi Marmorei fere ante eccles. S. Agathae in Diaconia positum.* Bull of Celestine III., A. 1192, *Bull. Vatican.*, i. 74. Jordan adds other passages, which show that the Subura and *Gallinae albae* lay in this mediaeval region. The church of S. Susanna and the Baths of Diocletian stood in the fourth region : De Rossi, *Bull. di Arch. Crist.*, 1870, pp. 89, 111.

Antonine column, the Via Lata, S. Silvestro in Capite, and the Posterula S. Agathae by the Tiber, and probably also the Pincian and the gate of S. Valentine (del Popolo). This district previously belonged partly to the ninth region (Circus Flaminius), partly to the seventh region (Via Lata).[1]

The sixth is marked by the church of S. Maria *in Sinikeo*, in the present quarter of Trevi.[2]

In the seventh stood the church of S. Agatha *super Suburram*, the column of Trajan, and the neighbouring Campus Kaloleonis.[3]

[1] These places are specified in Marini, n. 28, p. 45, A. 962: *sita namque Roma regio quinta*, A. 1008. *Regione quinta juxta arco marmoreo* on the Via Lata. Galletti, *Mscr. Vatican*, 8048, p. 53. The *Caput Tauri* (*porta di S. Lorenzo*), which was comprised in the ancient fifth region (*Esquiliae*) in the *Lib. Pontif.* ("Alex. I." and "Anast. II."), appears in the tenth century to have been included in region 3.

[2] *Regione Sexta ad S. Maria in Sinikeo*, in which a house is mentioned in 1019. Documents from S. Cyriacus and Nicholas in Via Lata in Galletti, *Mscr. Vatican.*, n. 8048; and frequently the same designation of the sixth region in Acts of this time. *S. Maria in Sinikeo* was also called *in Synodo* or *in Xenodochio*; it is the present *S. Maria in Trivio* or *dei Crociferi*. Jordan, ii. 320, gives a passage from the *Acta S. Susannae* (2 Aug., p. 632): *Regione sexta juxta vicum Mamertini* (al. *Mamuri*) *ante forum Sallustii*. A place called Diburo in the same region—Adinolfi, *Roma—di mezzo*, i. 176.

[3] Galletti, *Del. Prim.*, p. 232, A. 1003: *reg. septima juxta campo de quondam Kaloleoni. S. Nicol. sub. col. Trajana in reg. nona in campo Kaloleon.* is mentioned here by Galletti, p. 375; but it must be a mistake of the writer. Marini, n. 43, A. 1025. *Regione septim. in loco, qui vocatur Proba juxta Mon. S. Agathe sup. Sobora.* Here stood an ancient fountain called *Puteus de Proba*. In the work *De Vetustate Urbis*, attributed to Pomponius Letus, we read: *In eo Quirinali templum est S. Agathae; et in ipsa valle, non longe a templo S. Vitalis est puteus, qui dicitur puteus domine Probae.* Also in the Privil. of John X. for Subiaco the Suburra is again spoken of; this region must consequently have extended as far as region 3.

The eighth was known as Sub Capitolio in the tenth century, and is frequently mentioned in the Catalogue of the Popes. The ancient Forum Romanum had therefore retained its old number.

The ninth was in the district where stood S. Eustachio, the Navona, the Pantheon, the Thermae of Alexander, and S. Lorenzo in Lucina. It embraced the actual Field of Mars, and consequently the ancient ninth region, Circus Flaminius, out of which two regions had arisen. Accident has preserved the greater part of the documents belonging to this region of the tenth century. Frequent mention is here made of a spot *ad Scorticlarios* or *in Scorticlam*, which gave its name to the entire district. It denotes the tanners' quarter, which now lies by the river in the Regola, but which then lay by the Baths of Alexander, near the Tiber.[1]

The tenth and eleventh regions are not mentioned in any contemporary document; the twelfth, however, appears in a diploma with the ancient name *Piscina Publica*, which it therefore retained unaltered.[2]

In the Middle Ages the ancient thirteenth region

[1] *Scorticare*; from *scortum*, skin stripped from the body. Even in the time of Cola Regio 5 was called *Pontis et Scortichiariorum*. In Galletti, *Prim.*, n. 26, A. 1010, we find *in reg. IX. ad Scorticlarios thermae Alex.*, but also *Ubi dicitur Agones* (n. 27, A. 1011, n. 31, A. 1017). *Chron. Farf.*, pp. 421, 474, 649: *infra therm. Alex. posit. Reg. VIII. ad Scorticlarios*; and Gall., n. 27, 28, A. 1076, *S. Laurentii qui vocatur illicina* (*in Lucina*) is mentioned in region 9. Galletti, n. 50.

[2] *Rome regione duodecima in piscina publica, ubi dicitur Sco Gregorio. Mscr. Vatican.*, 7931, p. 36; Diploma of John XVIII. for S. Cosma *in mica aurea*, A. 1005. This document enables me to fix the number of regions in the Middle Ages at twelve.

(Aventinus) was apparently merged in the first region, which embraced the Aventine. Trastevere, on the other hand, is still known as the fourteenth region in the eleventh century as in ancient times.[1]

Streets.

As the names Via Lata, Caput Africae, and Suburra had survived, so must other streets have still retained their ancient designations. In the meantime, however, the majority were called after churches, some after conspicuous monuments, such as the Colosseum, the Theatre of Marcellus, and the Marble Colossi. The chief thoroughfares were frequently spoken of in documents as Via Publica or Communis, and a Via Pontificalis, which led through the Field of Mars to S. Peter's, existed as early as the tenth century.[2] These irregular streets, of which some were ancient, others recently constructed amid ruins and rubbish, must have worn a gloomy and curious aspect. Their narrowness and their confused character, combined with the rough exterior of their dwellings, would probably have repelled the beholder, while the picturesqueness of their architecture would have wakened his admiration. As is still frequently the case, each Roman house had a separate flight of steps; doors and windows were in the form of Roman arches; the cornices

[1] Reg. XIV., *Transtiberim in loco qui vocatur mica aurea*, the bull (quoted above) of John XVIII. of March 29, 1005, for S. Cosma e Damiano, recently printed in *Pont. R. inedita*, ii. n. 93 (1884) by Pflugk-Hartung. *Regione quartadecima Transtiberini*, Document of A. 1037 from S. Maria in Trastev. Galletti, *Mscr. Vatican.*, n. 8051, p. 6.

[2] *Per viam communem, que est pergens ad viam pontificalem euntium ad b. Petrum Ap.* Galletti, *Del. Prim.*, n. 31; *Chron. Farfa.*, p. 539, A. 1017.

were marked with the edges of tiles; the roofs were frequently covered with shingles; the walls, built of bricks, were probably devoid of plaster. The houses as a rule possessed an attic, which explains the expression *casa solorata* so frequently encountered. Entrance halls, which were known throughout Italy by the German word *laubia*, supported by pillars or antique columns, were universal and long survived in Rome. In the present day we must explore the Trastevere or the Pigna and Parione quarter to discover the last remains of this species of mediaeval architecture. No authentic description of a Roman dwelling-house of the upper class of the tenth century has come down to us, and that of a palace of the Dukes of Spoleto seems to apply to an ancient building.[1] The building is divided into twelve distinct parts, which are thus explained: the Proaulium and Salutatorium; the Consistorium, in which the inmates assembled and washed their hands before meals; the Trichorus or dining-room; the Zetas Hyemalis, a warmed room for winter use; the Zetas Estivalis, a cool room for summer; the Epikastorium (perhaps Epidikasterium), a room for business; beside it a Triclinia, each containing three couches; baths; a gymnasium or place for amusement; the kitchen; the Columbum, from which water flowed into the kitchen; the Hippodrome, and Arcus de-

Houses.

[1] "Descrizione d'un Palazzo—in un Cod. del X. o XI. sec. nell' archivio della Basil. Vaticana," in Fatteschi, *Duchi di Spoleto*, p. 349. The *Fragment of Farfa* somewhat differs from this; see Mabillon, *Annal. Ben. ad A.* 814, and Muratori for the same year. I have found yet another fragment in *Cod. Vat.*, 3851.

ambulatorii, colonnades with which was also connected the treasure chamber.[1]

Some of the ancient palaces which had formerly belonged to the noble families of Cethegus, Maximus, Gracchus, or Anicius may have survived to the tenth century, although ruin and repeated transformations may have rendered them unrecognisable. For why should not a private house, constructed of the same imperishable materials, have endured as well as a temple or a triumphal arch? Other fortress-like dwellings had recently arisen, and in almost every instance on the foundations of ancient buildings. Were we permitted to visit the palace of Marozia on the Aventine, the palace of Alberic near S. Apostoli, the dwellings of the Baruncii, of the Cencii, and of the Crescentii in the neighbourhood of the Pantheon, or the Imperial fortress of Otto III., we should find buildings of brick marvellously decorated with ancient consoles and friezes, their surface broken by arched windows with their little columns, such as may still be seen in the so-called Casa di Crescenzio, the oldest private building of the Middle Ages now known in Rome. Ancient monuments bestowed their finest ornaments on churches and palaces, and when we look with surprise at the present day at the many splendid columns of Corinthian and Ionic architecture used as supports in wretched buildings in some of the ancient quarters of the city, we may imagine how in the tenth century almost all the

[1] De Rossi believes that this description refers to the Roman Imperial palace. See on this subject his *Roma sotteranea*, iii. 458 f., and his *Piante icnografiche*, p. 123 *sq*.

larger houses were enriched with similar relics of antiquity. The palace of Alberic probably displayed many ancient mosaic pavements, vases, and vessels, but scarcely a single statue. It undoubtedly contained *lectuli* or couches overlaid with gilt carving, and hung with oriental silk brocades such as Ratherius found in the episcopal dwellings. The arrangement of these rooms, with their unwieldy gilt and sculptured furniture, their seats, derived from the antique, their bronze candelabra, their cabinets empty of books, but containing golden beakers (*Scyphi*) or silver craters or drinking cups (*Conchae*), may be restored from the mosaics or miniatures of the time. These show us that luxury borrowed its fantastic forms, its arabesque diversity, and its mosaic decoration chiefly from Byzantium.

Ancient monuments.

The number of ancient buildings was still immense. The greater part of the triumphal arches, porticoes, theatres, baths and temples existed as magnificent ruins, and at every step displayed to living generations the greatness of the past, the insignificance of the present. And it is solely by means of this antique character—a character which dominated the city throughout the entire Middle Ages—that many historic phenomena can be explained. Since the days of Totila no enemy had injured Rome; no emperor or pope, however, had protected the monuments. Charles the Great had already carried off columns and sculptures to Aachen, and the popes, who at first looked on the ancient monuments as the property of the city, had soon neither mind nor time nor power to trouble themselves about their

existence. The Romans were left at liberty to plunder the city; priests purloined columns and marbles for their churches, nobles and clergy built towers upon the splendid structures of antiquity; the burghers erected their forges, looms and spinning factories in bath and circus.[1] When the fishermen of the Tiber offered his spoils for sale on the bridges, or the butcher displayed his meat, or the baker his loaves, in the Theatre of Marcellus, these wares were exposed on blocks of rarest marble, which had once perhaps served as seats in theatre or circus for the rulers of the world, for Caesar, Mark Antony or Augustus, and for many a consul and senator. The sarcophagi of heroes were employed as cisterns, wash-tubs, or troughs for swine, even as they are to-day. The table of the shoemaker or the tailor may with equal likelihood have been the cippus of some illustrious Roman, or a slab of alabaster at which some noble matron had performed her toilette in days long past. Although in the tenth century the city probably retained but few of her ancient statues in bronze, the number of marble statues must still have been considerable. In almost every street or square the eye must have rested on the prostrate or mutilated works of ancient art; and porticoes, theatres, and baths had not even yet so hopelessly degenerated into dust-heaps as to have become completely divested of all their sculptured ornament. Statues of emperors and illustrious Romans stood or lay

[1] The name of the present street *Le botteghe oscure* originated from the booths erected in the dark porticoes of the Circus Flaminius. An example of the way in which artisans made use of the monuments of antiquity is still to be found in the Theatre of Marcellus.

uncovered on the ground; many ancient frescoes still remained on the walls. The feeling for works of art, however, was so utterly extinct that no author of the time accords them a single word. The Romans themselves regarded them simply as serviceable material. For centuries the city had resembled a vast limekiln into which the costliest marble was thrown and there reduced to mortar. It is not without reason that in diplomas of the tenth and eleventh centuries names such as Calcarius, the lime-burner, are of frequent occurrence. These names were not used to denote the occupation of their owners, but as signifying that these men were the possessors of, or lived beside limekilns.[1] Thus, for centuries, the Romans sacked and destroyed ancient Rome; they cut it and broke it in pieces, they burned and transformed it, yet never wholly swept it away.

[1] A. 1023 *Rodulpho, qui resedit ad Calcaria* (Gall., *Del. Prim.*, n. 34). *Reg. Farf.*, n. DCCCI. A. 1043: *Crescentius vir magnif. calcararius.* S. Niccolo de' Cesarini was then called *de Calcarario in regione vineae Thedemarii.* The *Ordo Rom.*, xii. (Mabill., ii.) in saec. xii. also mentions S. Lawrence *in Calcario.* Even in 1426 a mandate of Martin V. speaks of Romans as *civibus et calcarensibus Romanis de regione Pinee.* E. Müntz, *Les Antiq. de la ville de Rome*, Paris, 1886, p. 37. There were such limekilns more especially in the Field of Mars, but traces of them have also been discovered on the Forum, on the marble pavement of the *Basilica Julia*, and in front of the Temple of Faustina. Jordan, *Topogr. Roms*, i. 65. In 1883 limekilns were discovered even in the newly excavated Atrium of the House of the Vestals.

5. Walk through the City in the Time of Otto III. — The Palatine — The Septizonium — The Forum — SS. Sergius and Bacchus — The Infernus—Marforio—The Capitol—S. Maria in Captolio—Campus Caloleonis—The Column of Trajan—The Column of Marcus Aurelius—Campo Marzo—Mons Augustus—The Navona—The Churches belonging to Farfa—S. Eustachius in Platana—Legend of S. Eustachius—S. Maria in the Minervium—Camigliano—Arcus Manus Carneae—Parione—The Bridges over the Tiber—Temples of Fortuna Virilis and Vesta—Concluding Remarks.

The reader will perhaps accompany us in a brief survey of Rome in the time of Otto III., or rather in a visit to a few of the more renowned quarters of the city. Let us first turn to the Palatine. The imperial palaces still survived as colossal ruins, filled with forgotten works of art of every kind. Many rooms in this deserted labyrinth still retained their costly wall-coverings. A hall hung with draperies of cloth of gold, and chambers whose walls were lined with plates of silver or sheet lead, were discovered even in the days of Innocent X.[1] The Palatine, however, could have been but sparsely populated; and its churches were both few

The Palatine in the tenth century.

[1] Imperial coins of Lothar were found in excavations on the Palatine in 1869; nevertheless it is a mistake to infer in consequence that Charles the Great or his successors inhabited the ancient fortress of the Caesars when they came to Rome. Such coins could have been scattered there by the Romans themselves.

and insignificant, such, for instance, as S. Maria *in Pallara* (*Palatio*) or S. Sebastian *in Palladio*, on the site of the ancient Palladium, the scene of the martyrdom of the saint in the palace of Heliogabalus, and S. Lucia *in Septa solis* or *Septem viis*, which had arisen by the Septizonium as early as the time of Leo III.[1] This magnificent building of Severus, which lay to the south of the Palatine and nearly opposite S. Gregorio, was known in the Middle Ages as Septemzodium, Septodium, Septisolium, Septemsolia, even Sedem solis, seat of the sun. The *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln speaks of it as Septizonium, and we find it in a document of the year 975. It was called at the time "*Templum septem solia major*," to distinguish it from *septem solia minor*, an unknown monument in the neighbourhood, which had been presented by Stephen, son of the Consul and Dux Hildebrand, to the Abbot John of S. Gregorio to be used according to his pleasure, or even to be pulled down if the interests of the monastery demanded. In this time of party strife towers and strongholds were erected, not only by the nobles, but by the

Septizonium.

[1] The place *Septem viis* may have derived its name from the streets which still lead to the Arch of Constantine, to S. Giovanni e Paolo, to the Porta Capena, S. Balbina, to the gate of S. Paul, to the Circus Maximus, and to S. Bonaventura. The view that this name may be a corruption of *Septodium* (Jordan, ii. 512) is at least more far-fetched. For the description of the Septizonium, see Nardini, iii. 207. Donatus, *R. A.*, iii. c. 13, p. 339, derives the name from seven colonnades; Flav. Blond., *iii.* 56, thinks that it was derived from the image of the Sun, which stood above it; the *Graphia* and *Mirabilia* give the same explanation: *Septisolium fuit templ. Solis et Lunae.*—Hülsen, *Das Septizonium des Sep. Severus*, Berlin, 1886; Stevenson, "Il Settizonio Severiano," *Bull. Com. Comun.*, 1888.

monasteries also. Many ancient monuments had passed into private hands and were used as fortresses. The great Septizonium had thus become the property of the monastery and already been transformed into a fortress. The monks of S. Gregorio at this time also owned the triumphal Arch of Constantine, which was undoubtedly converted into a tower, and the monastery had thus intrenched itself behind various monuments of antiquity. The Arcus Triumphalis and the Circus (Maximus) are both mentioned (though only by name) in a document, and we learn that Stephen owned a part of the imperial palace, a portico with thirty-eight crypts or vaulted chambers being more especially mentioned.[1] As to the aspect worn by the Circus Maximus—where the two obelisks were already prostrate in the dust, though the triumphal arch at each end is still mentioned by the *Graphia*—we are completely ignorant, nor do we know how the Colosseum, which was not yet a fortress, may have impressed the beholder. We have good reason, however, for supposing that these dilapidated buildings still retained the greater portion of their outer walls as well as their rows of seats.

Circus Maximus.

[1] Diploma from S. Gregorio, Mittarelli, i. App. 41, p. 97: *Id est illud meum templum, quod Septem solia minor dicitur ut ab hac die vestre sib potestati et voluntati pro tuitione turris vestre, que Septem solia major dicitur, ad destruendum et suptus deprimendum quantum vobis placuerit. Nec non et omnes cryptas quas habeo in porticu qui vocatur mωδρῶmρωγγ supra dicta septem solia—numero trigintas et octo—posita Rome reg. secunda prope septem viis, a quarto latere via publica juxta circum, qui ducit ad arcum triumphali vestris juris—dat. A.* 1. *Bened. VII., A.* 8. *Otton. Ind.* 3. *m. Julio d.* 22. The Greek word has been explained as *porticus Materiani.* See Jordan, ii. 354, and Stevenson.

The utterly ruinous temple of Venus and Rome was already called, as in the *Graphia*, the *Templum Concordiae et Pietatis*. Its gigantic monolithic pillars of blue granite still stood in unimpaired splendour. The wayfarer still trod the ancient pavement of the Via Sacra as he passed through the Arch of the "Seven Candlesticks" to the Forum. Here the slope of the little Velian hill still sank abruptly, the Forum not being buried so deep in dust as at the present day.[1] Temples, porticoes, and basilicas stood in imposing desolation on every side, and the Roman wandered amid the countless ruins of columns, architraves, marble figures, in this his national museum, the haunted desertion and ruinous majesty of which must have produced an indescribable impression. The Forum could not yet have sunk to such utter decay as to have afforded a pasturage for cattle. But the statues had probably long been removed from the numerous pedestals which stood in front of the Basilica Julia and opposite the Capitol. The Forum.

If Otto III. had followed the path we have described accompanied by a Roman antiquary, the ignorant successor of Varro, his guide would have made these monuments of antiquity known to the Emperor under a curious medley of true and false names. He would have shown him the Templum Fatale, the Arch of Janus near S. Martina, a Templum Refugii beside S. Adriano in the ruins of the ancient

[1] [This is no longer the case. The Forum has for some years been excavated to the original level, and so far from "being buried deep in dust," it is kept in a state of exemplary but inartistic neatness.—TRANSLATOR.]

Curia; he would have pointed out the Arcus Fabianus near S. Lorenzo in Miranda as the *templum Latone*, but would have accorded its rightful name to the Temple of Concord beside S. Sergius. This celebrated building, which had once echoed to Cicero's magnificent orations, had perhaps been partially destroyed in the erection of a little church. The *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln had already beheld the church between the temple and the arch of Severus, which served it apparently as a bell tower. It seems to have stood in the neighbourhood of the Rostra, and had probably served to uphold as many of the ancient statues belonging to the earlier building as had survived the sixth century.[1] The church was dedicated not only to S. Sergius, but also to S. Bacchus, a saint who, curiously enough, appears on this ancient Pagan site. His appearance, however, was not singular in Rome, where the names of ancient gods and heroes are again found among Christian saints, as S. Achilleus, S. Quirinus, Dionysius, Hippolytus, Hermes; thus also S. Bacchus.

The Temple of Concord.

In the huge remains of the Basilica Julia, or in those of one of the sanctuaries of Vesta, perhaps the dwelling of her ancient priestesses, the tenth century archaeologist would have shown us the Temple of the terrible Catiline, and close by it the church of S.

[1] *Sci Sergii ibi umbilicum Romae*, says the *Anon.* of Einsiedeln. The exact site of the church is still disputed, the building having been removed by Paul III. in 1536. Camillo Re tries to discover it near the Arch of Severus and opposite the Rostra ("Il Campidoglio e le sue adiacenze nel sec. xiv.," *Bull. della Commiss. Arch. Comunale*, 1882, x. p. 125); he therein follows the view of Jordan, *Sylloge Inscr. Fori Romani* in *Ephem. Epigr.*, 1876, iii. 2539.

Antonius, on the site of the present S. Maria Liberatrice, the Deliverer from the pains of hell. He would have told us that this accursed spot, called Infernus, was the Lacus Curtius, and that here the magnanimous patriot had plunged headlong to save his country; and he might have added that a dragon, which had been killed by S. Sylvester, had once lain behind the bronze gates of a cave in the Palatine.[1] Beside the Mamertine prison, the Privata Mamertini of the Middle Ages, the antiquary would have shown us the statue of the River God, famed as Marforio, which lay there uninjured for centuries; and he would have told us that it was the statue of Mars.[2] The Via Sacra and its continuation the Clivus Capitolinus, or the Way of the Triumphators, paved with its broad, rough stones, still led past the Temples

[1] *Palatium Catiline, ubi est eccl. s. Antonini; juxta quam est locus qui dicitur Infernus—ubi Marcus Curtius, ut liberaretur civitas, responso suorum armatus proiecit se, et clausa est terra.—Graphia.* S. Sylvester is said to have built the present S. Maria *libera nos a poenis inferni*, which was also called S. Sylvestri *in Lacu* (sc. *Curtii*). Panciroli, *Tesor. nascosti*, p. 702, and Martinelli, p. 222.

[2] *Ante privatam Mamertini templum Martis ubi nunc jacet simulacrum ejus.—Graphia.* The word *Mamertini* remains unexplained. The celebrated Marforio, called *simulacrum Martis*, and also *Mamertini*, lay there until the time of Sixtus V.: the *Anon.* of Einsiedeln seems to speak of the same river god as Tiberis. The name is explained from an unknown *forum Martis*: in the description of the city by Joh. Caballini de Cerronibus about 1350, it is said: *Juxta quam (eccl. s. Adriani) est hodie simulacrum filii Martis bellicosi, quod Romano ydiomate dicitur Marfoli*, i.e., *Martis filii.* This explanation, however, is meaningless. I derive the name from that of a Roman Marfolio. For I have found not only the name Marifolle in use among the Italians, but also an inscription which says: *Nardus Marfoli de contrata S. Adriani sepultus in S. Maria de Araceli a.* 1452 (Jacovacci, *Familie Romane Mscr.* in the Vatican).

The Capitol.

of Saturn and Vespasian, and between countless ruins, up to the Capitol. Who can describe the tragic sight that there met the eye? Cassiodorus had called the Capitol for the last time the greatest wonder of Rome, and we have seen that even in the eighth century it was regarded as the chief marvel of the universe. But for a long time past we have not once heard its name. It had vanished from history, and the *Graphia* merely tells us that its walls were inlaid with glass and gold, without entering into any further description.[1] The convent of S. Maria in Capitolio is mentioned as early as the year 882, but the adjacent church in Ara Coeli, although probably already built, is nowhere spoken of.[2]

The once sumptuous Imperial Forums remain buried in complete silence, the Forum of Trajan excepted. That of Augustus had become so filled with ruins and vegetation as to have received from the populace the name of *Hortus mirabilis*. The

[1] Preller's opinion (*Philolog.*, i. i. 83), that in the year 850, Lewis had been crowned on the Capitol by Adrian II., is erroneous. Nibby, *Roma nel* 1838, took this statement from the *Chron. Casaurense* (Murat., ii. 778), which was not written until after the restoration of the Roman Senate. It also speaks merely of a triumph: *Romamque reversus Imperiali laurea pro triumpho a Dom. P. Adriano, et omni populo, et Senatu Rom. in Capitolio est coronatus.* Preller sees in a fable "the first symbol of the belief in the Capitol as the centre of Roman power." This idea was strange to the time; the Capitol was a ruin, and the notion of a coronation taking place there, instead of in S. Peter's, would have been regarded as a blasphemy.

[2] *Cod. Sessor.*, ccxvii. p. 19: *Teuzo abb. ven. Monas. S. Mariae Dei Gen. Virg. in Capitolio . . . A.* 882. *Monast. S. Mariae in Capitolio:* Marini, n. 28, A. 955, n. 29, A. 962.

Forum of Trajan was also in such ruinous condition that the documents in which it is mentioned speak of the *petrae* or stones which lay within it. The name Magnanapoli, borne by the street which leads from the Forum to the Quirinal, dates from this time.[1] On the other side of the Forum lay the Campus Caloleonis, now abbreviated into Carleone, so called from the palace of one of Alberic's Roman optimates.[2] Above the majestic ruins of the Ulpian libraries and basilicae, the lordly column of Trajan still towered unimpaired. Beside it stood the church *S. Nicolai sub columpnam Trajanam.* This church had greatly contributed to the ruin of the Forum, from which the materials of which it was built had been taken. It belonged to the parish of Santi Apostoli, and the column itself was probably also the property of the same basilica.[3]

Forum of Trajan.

[1] *Adriano quoddam de banneo neapolini: Cod. Sessor.*, ccxvii. p. 60, A. 938. I recognise therein the name *magnanapoli*, or properly *bagnanapoli*, which must be derived from *balneum*, and not as in Becker, i. 382, from *magnanimi Pauli*, nor from the *vado ad Neapolim* of the enchanter Virgil. The explanation of the word *Neapolini* is difficult; in some documents *Neapolis* stands in its place. Thus we have in the will of Giovanni Conti, May 3, 1226: *mons balnei Neapolis.* Signor Corvisieri remarked to me that the title of the *Balneum* may have come from the name Napoleo, borne by one of the Conti, dwelling on the spot. It is uncertain how old the name Napoleo may be. It became very common among the Orsini in later times.

[2] The combinations *Kalo-Leo*, *Kalo-Petro*, *Kalo-Johannes* are very frequent in documents of the time; I have never, however, discovered *Napo-Leo.*

[3] Galletti, *Del. Prim.*, p. 375 (A. 1026). In 1162 the church of S. Nicolai was deprived of the Column of Trajan, which was awarded instead to the Abbess of S. Cyriacus, later S. Maria in Via Lata. *Ibid.*, p. 323.

The Column of Marcus Aurelius.

The great column of Marcus Aurelius stood as it stands to-day. In 955 Agapitus II. confirmed it in possession to the monastery of S. Silvestro in Capite, and seven years later John XII. renewed the diploma. "We confirm *in integrum*," so runs the document, "the great marble column called Antonino, as it stands with its sculptures, together with the church of S. Andreas at its base, and the circumjacent soil, surrounded as it is on all sides by public streets in this city of Rome."[1] It is thus evident that it was encompassed by an open space, and a little church had consequently arisen beside this column also. These chapels were guard-houses, the monks who dwelt therein were the guardians, and to them we owe the preservation of these renowned monuments which tower in solitary grandeur above the ruins of history. Upon these columns S. Peter and S. Paul now stand as types of Rome's second term of universal dominion; and no more fitting site could the Apostles have found than the columns of the two Emperors, followers of a philosophy which prepared the way for Christianity. Pilgrims climbed these columns by the inner spiral staircase, as we climb them now to enjoy the magnificent view of the

[1] Marini, n. 28, 29: two important topographical documents of saec. x. *Columpna majure marmorea in integra qui dicitur Antonino sculpita ut videtur esse per omnia cum eccl. s. Andree ad pedes et terra in circuitu suo sicuti undique a publice vie circumdata esse videatur infra hanc Civitatem Rom. constructa* (n. 29). In n. 28 is added *cum cella sub se*, and this perhaps served the monks as a wine-cellar. In the Middle Ages the column was called Antonini, the name already used by the *Anon.* of Einsiedeln. We hear nothing more of the statue of the Emperor on the summit.

city from their summits. The monks must also have imposed a tax for the ascent; at least an inscription belonging to the year 1119, now placed in the portico of S. Silvestro, records that the pilgrims offered their oblations in the Church of S. Andrea beside the column of Marcus Aurelius, and that the monastery on this account leased the column as a lucrative source of revenue. It is curious to discover that the same practice had been in vogue in ancient times. Soon after the erection of the column, we learn that Adrastus, the freedman of the Emperor Septimius Severus, built a house in the neighbourhood of the column, in order to watch over it, or to collect the revenues which it yielded. Two marble inscriptions which inform us of the usage were discovered in the excavations of 1777, and these inscriptions had been placed in the guard-house by Adrastus.[1] The smaller column also, which was erected by Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus to their father Antoninus Pius, stood in the neighbourhood of the present Monte Citorio. It was of red granite, and only fifty feet in height; and as it is mentioned neither by the *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln, nor by the *Graphia* or *Mirabilia*, it is probable that it was levelled to the dust in the eleventh century.[2]

[1] Fea, *Sulle Rov.*, p. 350. In the first: *Adrasto Procuratori Columnae Divi Marci ut ad voluptatem suam Hospitium sibi extruat. Quod ut habeat sui juris et ad heredes transmittat. Litterae Datae viii. Idus Aug. Romae Falcone et Claro Coss.*

[2] It was excavated in 1704. Pius VI. had it sawed in pieces and utilised for the Vatican Library. Its pedestal still stands in the Vatican garden. Vignoli, *De columna Imp. Antonini Pii*, Rome, 1705.

The Field of Mars.

In the tenth century the Field of Mars, already called Campo Marzo, displayed the magnificent ruins of a city of marble. Of the various constructions of the Antonines, the vast remains of the basilica or temple still existed, as is shown by the remains of the pillared front of the Dogana. Picture the space from the Pantheon to the Mausoleum of Augustus filled by the ruins of the Baths of Agrippa and Alexander, of the Stadium of Domitian, and of the Odeum, all of which stood side by side. Imagine, further, the countless porticoes which extended from the Via Lata, the Porta Flaminia, and the Bridge of Hadrian across the Campus Martius, and we have before us a world of wonders half in ruins. Within the gloomy vaults of these various buildings wretched beings, living like troglodytes, had made their miserable homes, others had constructed pitiful dwellings which clung like swallows' nests to the ruinous walls. These people planted vegetables and vines on the mounds of rubbish which had arisen on the Field of Mars; streets gradually took shape, and led to churches, which, built from ruins in the midst of ruins, lent the streets a purpose and a name. The black tower of some Roman calling himself Consul or Judex rose here and there from the midst of decay.

Mausoleum of Augustus.

The Mausoleum of Augustus had not yet been converted into a fortress. Covered with earth and overgrown with trees, it bore so much the aspect of a hill as to receive the name of one, and was known in the tenth century as *Mons Augustus*, a name corrupted in the vulgar tongue into *Austa* or *L'austa*.

Legend related that the Emperor Octavian caused a basketful of earth from every province in the Empire to be thrown upon his grave, in order that he might rest on the soil of the entire world which he had ruled. In accordance with the precedent shown in the tomb of Hadrian, a chapel had been built to the Archangel Michael on the summit of the mausoleum.[1] The church of S. Maria or Martina in Augusta, which was later transformed into the hospital of S. Giacomo degli Incurabili, stood at this time beside the tomb. Vineyards and fields belonging to the monastery lay around. The ruinous walls with their shattered towers still led from the Porta Flaminia along the river as far as the Bridge of Hadrian, but were broken by several posterulae or river gates.[2]

The present Porta del Popolo was, as in the *Graphia*, still called Flaminia, although even at this

[1] We learn this from the same diplomas of Agapitus II. and John XII., which confirmed the convent of S. Silvestro in possession of this tomb. *Montem in integro qui appellatur Agusto cum eccl. s. Angeli in cacumine ipsius montis. Dipl.* A. 955 and A. 962. The term *Mons*, as applied to a tomb, is extended by Pier Damiani to the tomb of Hadrian. *Vita S. Romualdi*, c. 25. The *Graphia* still calls it *Templum*, knows of the interior mortuary chambers arranged in a circle with their inscriptions, and relates the legend of the earth being piled up.

[2] *Posterula antiqua, que olim—S. Agathe*, and *Posterula a Pigna:* the same diploma, n. 29, A. 962. *Pila* was also used instead of *Pigna.* Then *Posterula di S. Lucia* ; and *Post. di S. Maria*, also called *Dimizia.* C. Corvisieri, "Delle Posterule Tiberine," *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.* i., 1878. Further, *Posterula de Episcopo*, Galletti, *Prim.*, n. 29, A. 1012 ; *Reg. Farf.*, 697 ; close to the spot *Captum Seccuta*, or *Cantusecutu.* In the *Reg. Subl.*, p. 63, A. 938, appears the name *centum scuta*, of which the others are probably corruptions. A sixth *Posterula* in the *Regola*, in Corvisieri, p. 156.

time it also bore the name S. Valentini, from the church outside the gate. An ancient monument, called *Trullus*, stood in its neighbourhood. This was apparently a tomb, and was known to the people as the tomb of Nero.[1] A series of ruinous sepulchral monuments stood at each side of the Via Flaminia outside the gate, and among them was the tomb of the celebrated charioteer Gutta Calpurnianus.[2] The space covered by the present Piazza del Popolo was filled by fields and gardens, as was the "*Mons Pinzi*" of those days, on which stood a church of S. Felix. Another ancient tomb in the form of a pyramid also stood on the piazza at the foot of the Pincio, possibly on the spot now occupied by S. Maria dei Miracoli. It was called the *Meta*. The entire Field of Mars was covered by vineyards and vegetable gardens. The Stadium of Domitian lay in ruin. The *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln wrongly terms it "Circus Flaminius, where S. Agnes lies," from the ancient region of that name, to which it belonged. In the tenth century, however, it was known in popular speech as *Agonis*, from *Agon* or *Circus Agonalis*. From the name "*in Agona*" bestowed on this district gradu-

Navona.

ally arose the corruption *n'Agona*, finally *Navona*, the name by which the largest and finest of the

[1] A plan of the city of the fifteenth century shows a representation of the tower-shaped *Trullus*, which it calls *Turris ubi umbra neronis diu mansitavit*. *Piante icnografiche* of de Rossi, tav. iii.

[2] The inscription of Gutta's monument was copied by the *Anon.* of Einsiedeln. Concerning the surroundings of the Porta Flaminia, see the treatise of Visconti and Vespignani, "Delle scoperte avvenute per la demol. delle torri della Porta Flaminia (*Bull. della Comm. Archeol.*, 1877, v. 184 f.).

Roman public piazzas is known at the present day.[1]

Several churches had been already built out of the materials of the circus. On one side was the diaconate of S. Agnes in Agone, the scene of the legend of the saint; on the other, the parish church of S. Apollinaris, built apparently on the ruins of a temple to Apollo, who now gave place to his canonised namesake, the first Bishop of Ravenna.[2] The church of S. Eustachio, like other Roman monasteries and basilicas, which gradually appropriated the soil of the city together with its monuments, had annexed possessions in this region, and even the distant Abbey of Farfa owned fields, houses, gardens and crypts of the ruined stadium, or of the adjacent Baths of Alexander Severus. Beside these ruined baths, three small churches also belonged to the Abbey, S. Maria, S. Benedict, and S. Salvator. The monastery stood in constant strife with the presbyters of S. Eustachio on account of these possessions, and it is to the documents of this trial that we owe our topographical knowledge of the region *Agone* or *in Scorticlariis*.[3] S. Maria of Farfa must be the present church of S. Luigi dei Francesi; the chapel of S. Benedict fell into ruin, but

Churches belonging to Farfa in the Field of Mars.

[1] *Posita Rome regione nona, ubi dicitur Agones. Reg. Farf.*, n. 690. Galletti, *Del. Prim.*, n. 27, A. 1011. *Terra et campus Agonis cum casis, hortis, et cryptis: Chron. Farf.*, p. 421. Hence Becker, i. 671, has convinced himself that *Navona* actually arose from *Agon*. In saec. xv. the Roman archaeologists again wrongly placed the Circus Flaminius in the Navona.

[2] First mention of this church in the *Lib. Pontif.*, "Vita Hadriani I.," n. 332.

[3] *S. Maria juxta Thermas Alexandrinas.* Galletti, *Gabio*, n. 17, after *Reg. Farf.*, 461, A. 998. Galletti, *Del. Prim.*, n. 26, 27, 28.

S. Salvator still remains bearing the suffix *in Thermis*, Here, close to the Stadium of Domitian, stood the Baths of Nero, enlarged by Alexander Severus, and extending from S. Eustachio to S. Apollinare.[1] The newer quarter, where S. Eustachio, the Madama, and Giustiniani palaces and S. Luigi stand, had arisen from their ruins, and here in still later times the magnificent remains of halls, arches, columns, and ornaments of every kind were discovered. An ancient church, S. Trifon *in Posterula*, stood on the site of the present fountain of the Scrofa, and beside the ruins of an ancient building which had served for the cremation of dead emperors. S. Trifon was splendidly rebuilt about the year 956, and endowed with numerous privileges by Crescentius, Prefect of the city.[2]

S. Eustachius and the legend of the Saint.

The church of S. Eustachio, surnamed *in Platana*, perhaps from some neighbouring plane-tree, had, according to tradition, been built in a palace in the Baths of Alexander. Its foundation must have been of early date, since it was already a diaconate in 795,[3] in the time of Leo III. It formed the centre of a quarter in the Middle Ages, and gave its name alike to the region and to a celebrated patrician family. The legend of the saint, whose Pagan name was Placidus, deserves our attention. As one of Trajan's

[1] I notice in Benedict of Soracte, c. 33 : *infra civis Roma non longe ab aecclesia s. Apolenaris a templum Alexandrini.* The *Anon.* of Einsiedeln distinguishes : to the left *Sci Apollinaris* ; to the right *Thermae Alexandrini et sci Eustachii.*

[2] The bull of John XII. concerning it, in Corvisieri, *Delle posterule tiberine*, p. 165. S. Agostino took the place of S. Trifonis after 1470.

[3] Mariano Armellini, *Chiese di Roma*, p. 234.

generals, he subjugated Dacians and Jews, and returned in triumph to Rome. One day, while hunting between Tibur and Praeneste, he pursued a stag up the mountain Vulturellus (near Guadagnolo), and suddenly perceived the radiant face of Christ between the antlers of the animal. The Saviour commanded him to return to Rome and be baptised. Placidus received the Christian name of Eustachius, had his wife baptised with the name of Trojana Theopista, his sons with those of Agapitus and Theopistos. A divine visitation rendered him as poor as Job. He departed for Egypt and wandered in the desert. Sailors carried off his wife, a lion and a wolf deprived him of his sons, and he himself became the bondsman of an Egyptian master. Trajan meanwhile, engaged in the Persian war, caused search to be made all the world over for Placidus, who was at last recognised by two old centurions by a scar which he had received in battle. They clothed the reluctant general in magnificent robes, and brought him to Rome, where he found the throne of his friend already occupied by Hadrian. He undertook the command in the war against the Persians, accidentally recovered wife and children, and, the campaign ended, re-entered Rome crowned with laurels. The Senate decreed him a triumphal arch. Eustachius, in secret a Christian, refused to sacrifice to Jupiter. He acknowledged his faith, and with his family was condemned to death. The lions of the arena lay down in the dust before him; the martyr was therefore thrown into a brazen bull heated red-hot. When the executioner afterwards

opened the bull he found Eustachius, his wife, and children dead but unconsumed. The Christians buried him in his own house; the Romans caused themselves to be baptised, and the repentant Hadrian swallowed poison at Cumae.[1]

Eustachius possesses a still further importance for Rome. He became the hero of a most curious genealogy. In the twelfth century, and probably even earlier, the Romans took pleasure in tracing the origin of their noble families back to antiquity. Their genealogical trees were suddenly found to have been offshoots of the celebrated laurel of Augustus on the Palatine, or to have grown in the gardens of Maecenas or of Pompey, of the Scipios or the Maximi. Since the family of the Counts of Tusculum had become transformed into the Counts of S. Eustachio, they traced their descent, by a bold stroke of imagination, from the renowned Octavius Mamilius of Tusculum, who had fallen in the battle of Lake Regillus. From him the Octavii were descended; from the Emperor Octavian the Senator Agapitus Octavius, the father of Placidus or Eustachius. Tertullus, father of S. Placidus (the pupil of Benedict), also belonged to the same family, and from the time of Mamilius this family had retained possession of

[1] Simon Metaphrastes, in Surius, vi. ad. 1 Nov., and Anast. Kircher, *Historia Eustachio-Mariana*, Rome, 1665. According to legend, Constantine and Sylvester had built the still existing place of pilgrimage on Monte Guadagnolo. Trajan again appears in mediaeval legend on the spot near the Pantheon. The *Mirabilia* mention the Arcus Pietatis in the district of Maria Rotunda, and transfer the fable of the suppliant widow to this spot. *Chron. Farf.* says: *S. Eustachius in Platana*; Martinelli wrongly writes *in Platea*.

Tusculum, which Tertullus presented to the monastery of Subiaco. Tertullus was naturally also a cousin of the Emperor Justinian, and to the Octavian house the great Pope Gregory and the Anicii family naturally traced their origin. Thus from the fabulous Octavius Mamilius were descended not only the Counts of Tusculum, but also the Pierleoni, the Counts of Segni, of Poli and of Valmontone; further the Frangipani, who founded the house of Austria.[1]

The Minervium.

On the other side of the Pantheon the *Anonymous* of Einsiedeln already found the convent of S. Maria in the Minervium,—that is to say, the ruins of the ancient Temple of Minerva, and the *Graphia* records that "near the Pantheon is the Temple of Minerva Chalcidie." But a short way off stood a triumphal arch ascribed to Camillus, whence this neighbourhood was called Camigliano. A street of great antiquity at the same place was named "at the two lovers," and the adjacent monastery of S. Salvator was hence called *ad duos amantes*.[2] The Iseum stood at the side, and in its ruins still remained the beautiful groups of the Nile and of the Tiber, now in the Vatican, which, like the Marforio, had happily escaped destruction.

[1] See these genealogical trees in Zazzera and Kircher. These childish jests passed into history.

[2] Galletti, *Del. Prim.*, p. 259 (*Dipl.* A. 1026) and p. 354, where he tries to find the district *ad duos amantes*, as this neighbourhood is already called, in the *Vita S. Sylvestri* by the *Collegio Romano*. The *Graphia: in Camiliano, ubi nunc est s. Cyriacus fuit templum Veste.* Cyriacus is the present S. Maria in Via Lata. The Arch of Camillus stood beside S. Marta. Clement VIII. first allowed Cardinal Salviati to break up the arch in order to obtain lime for building his palace (Doria Pamfili). Martinelli, *Primo Trofeo*, p. 122; Galletti, *Del. Prim.*, p. 374.

The Arch Manus Carneae.

Another triumphal arch frequently mentioned in the Middle Ages stood in the neighbourhood of S. Marco. It was called, "of the stone hand," *arcus manus carneae*, and was situated at the entrance of the present Via Macello de' Corvi (Raven-market), a name which, correctly or otherwise, has been held to be a corruption of *manus carnea*. It is probable that a hand, the emblem of a cohort, was there displayed, and legend relates that it was the hand of the executioner who, in the reign of Diocletian, had been turned to stone for having put the pious Lucina to death.[1]

Parione.

Although the Theatre of Pompey is still mentioned as Templum or Theatrum, we know nothing as to its condition. Its ruins, like those of other ancient buildings, were of such extent that even in the tenth century the surrounding quarter was called "Parione," the name borne by the sixth region in the present day. It was further defined by a large ancient urn, a striking object in the eyes of the people.[2] The

[1] The legend in the *Graphia*. The explanation of Urlichs in *Stadtbeschr.*, iii. 3, p. 89. In the *Anon. Magliab.*, *manus carnea* is already distorted into *carrili: et vulgariter manum carne*, i.e., *carrili non habet epitaphium*.

[2] *Ad concam Parrionis fuit templum Gnei Pompeji mire magnit. et pulcritudinis.—Graphia.* I explain this name through *Parioni* from *Parietis*, great ruined walls, as *Arcioni* from *Arcus*, great ruined arches, and this is proved beyond a doubt by a diploma of the year 850, in Galletti, *D. Prim.*, p. 187: *terra sementaricia—in quo sunt parietina destructa que vocatur Parrioni*, that is near S. Sebastian. The region Parione owes its name to the ruins, be they those of the theatre of Pompey or of some other great monument. For that an actual monument bore the name Parione through the entire Middle Ages is evident from the description of the coronation of Boniface VIII. (in Cancellieri, *De Possessu*, p. 25), where we read :—

Circus Flaminius only receives a cursory notice; it appears again, however, as the "Golden Fortress." The Theatre of Marcellus retains its ancient name in documents, although it is probable that it was already called *Antonini* by the populace; and along the river we encountered the already familiar sites, the *Ripa Graeca*, opposite S. Maria in Cosmedin, and the ancient *Marmorata*.[1]

Bridges of the Tiber.

A memorable document of the year 1018, issued by the Bishopric of Portus, the jurisdiction of which extended over the island in the Tiber and the Trastevere, has preserved the names of some of the Roman bridges at this period. It describes the diocese of Portus according to its boundaries, and begins its narration "from the broken bridge, where the water flows, through the wall of the Trasteverine city, through the Septimian Gate, through the gate of S. Pancratius," then goes in the Campagna across the river Arrone past the lighthouse to the sea, then back "through the middle of the great river to Rome, as far as the broken bridge near the Marmorata, to the Bridge of S. Maria, to the Bridge of the Jews into the middle of the river, and straight on in the

Turri relicta
De Campo, Judaea canens, quae caecula corde est,
Occurrit vesana Duci, Parione sub ipso.

The Campus is the Campo di Flore. In the eleventh century, and apparently even earlier, the *Turris* of Cencius stood in Parione, and was also called *Parionis*; it is thus spoken of in the fifteenth century by Leon Battista Alberti, *Descriptio Urbis Romae*; in De Rossi, *Piante icnogr.*, p. 137.

[1] Diploma of Otto III. for S. Bonif., Nerini, p. 347, and Marini, n. 42 and 49.

middle to the broken bridge already mentioned, which is the nearest to the Catholic churches in Trastevere, S. Maria, S. Chrysogonus, and S. Cecilia, and to the monasteries of S. Pancratius and SS. Cosma and Damianus." It is thus evident—as the description starts with the present Ponte Sisto—that this bridge was already broken; the boundary follows the Trasteverine wall, and continues through the Septimian Gate. It appears also that there was a second ruined bridge at the Marmorata, and this bridge, which was called *Probi* or *Theodosii in Riparmea* (*ripa marmorea*) in the Middle Ages, may still be seen below the Aventine. It also follows that the present Ponte Rotto, now a chain bridge, was at that time called S. Maria, from a church which stood beside it; and lastly, that the bridge, now known as "*Quattro Capi*" (formerly *Fabricii*), was then called the Bridge of the Jews, because the Jews even then dwelt in its immediate neighbourhood.[1]

Temples of Fortuna Virilis and of Vesta.

Three remarkable buildings rose side by side close to the Palatine Bridge—the so-called Temple of Fortuna Virilis, the circular temple called that of Vesta, and the mutilated bridge-tower known as the House of Pilate, of Crescentius, or even as that of Cola di Rienzo. The first of these temples, a Pseudoperipteros

[1] See the diplomas mentioned in Marini. N. 49 is the ratification of Leo IX. of 1049, and is clearer than n. 42. The *Graphia* notes: (1) the P. Sisto with *Antonini in arenula*—the *Anon. Magliab.* thus: *alius ruptus tremulus* (corrupted from *in arenula*), *canicularius* (corrupted from *janiculensis et aurelius*). (2) *Pons Theodosii in Riparmea, pons Valentiniani*, which I hold to be identical. (3) *Pons Senatorum S. Marie; Anon. Magl.* better: *Senatorum et S. Marie.* (4) *Fabricii in ponte Judeorum; Anon. Magl.* better: *P. Fabricius Judeorum.*

of Ionic style, in good preservation and of severely beautiful form, probably belongs to republican times. This sanctuary of the Virile Fortune of Servius Tullius, as it was thought fit to call it, was, according to tradition, transformed into a church under John VIII. The Egyptian Mary, a beautiful sinner who had expiated a dissolute career by penance in the desert, was afterwards installed in the temple which now bears her name, S. Maria Egiziaca. The Temple of Vesta opposite, called Templum Sibyllae in the Middle Ages, was also transformed into a church, although we know not at what date; it is known as S. Stefano delle Carozze, or S. Maria del Sole, after an image of a saint.[1] We shall have occasion later to speak of the so-called House of Pilate. All these monuments, together with the bridge and S. Maria in Cosmedin, render this district one of the most interesting in Rome.

Such is our Graphia of the city in the tenth century. We see that the Field of Mars was already thickly covered with buildings, that the Quirinal, Viminal, and Esquiline Hills remained inhabited, but that fields and vineyards covered the ground beside the city walls, as at the present day. The Coelian, where an ancient street, the *Caput Africae*, continued to exist for centuries, and the Aventine seem more especially to have been covered with buildings and

[1] Panciroli, p. 628; Martinelli, p. 180; the *Martirol. Roman.* for the 2nd April. The Temple of Vesta was formerly made into the Temple of a Hercules Victor; the archaeologists have now dedicated it to Cybele; this goddess will, however, soon have to withdraw to make room for another divinity, until the latter is in turn banished by an archaeological revolution.

streets; the district beside the Forum was inhabited, the Subura still survived. The most splendid quarter, however, was the Via Lata. Trastevere must also have been thickly populated. Finally, Leo IV. had founded a new civic colony in the Vatican suburb by building the Leonina, the so-called "Portico of S. Peter's."

INDEX.

Abbacyrus, S., ch., 29 note.
Abbeys, in Rome, 32.
Abbo, 406 note.
Abul Kasem, 392 and note.
Adalbert, son of Berengar, 322, 331, 342, 349, 360, 369.
Adalbert, Count, 116.
Adalbert of Ivrea, 272, 276.
Adalbert, Bp. of Prague, 402–3, 415; bldgs. erected in his honour, 482–3; his biography, 515.
Adalbert of Tuscany, 176, 178, 194, 196, 218, 231, 237; supports Sergius, 244; fights against the Saracens, 266, 272, 276.
Adalberti et Paulini, SS., ch., 483 note.
Adam, Abbot, 438.
Adelaide, Empress, marries Lothar, 319, 322; marries Otto I., 323, 324, 334, 391; her death, 480, 507.
Adelchis of Benevento, takes prisoner Lewis II., 168; excommunicated, 169–70.
Adelhard, 16.
Adolf, Deacon, 14.
Adminiculator, 444.
Adrian II., Pope, 155; issues amnesty, 156; position in Rome, 159; his daughter, 159; excommunicates Anastasius, 160; dealings with Lothar, 162–3; crowns Lewis II., 169; releases him from his oath, 169; his death, 171.
Adrian III., Pope, 206–7.
Aemiliana, titular ch., 29.
Agapitus II., Pope, 321, 323, 329.
Agatha, S., in Subura, ch., 29, 531, 532 and note.
Agatha, S., de Posterula, ch., 551 note.
Agatha, S., Region, 532.
Agatho of Todi, 116.
Agildruda, 220, 222, 223, 236.
Agiprand, 268.
Agnellus, 19, 148.
Agnese, S., in Agone, ch., 552–3.
Agones, Region, 552–3.
Agropolis, 185.
Agulia, 528 and note.
Alberic I., 254–5 and notes; marries Marozia, 256, 267; his position in Rome, 271; his fate, 274–5 and notes.
Alberic II., his birth, 271; revolts against Hugo, 289; Princeps, 290, 292; his position, 293, 296; coins, 299 note; palace, 300; energetic rule, 302; war with Hugo, 303; marries Alda, 304; relations with Byzantium, 305; with Leo VII., 306; care for the convents, 312; reforms Farfa, 314; acquires the Sabina, 316; suppresses a revolt, 317; at war with Hugo, 319; attitude towards Otto I., 324; his death, 325.
Alda, wife of Alberic, 304, 328 and note.

Alda, wife of Hugo, 285.
Alexander, Emperor, 521.
Alexius, S., legend of, 389.
Alfred the Great, 109, 512.
Aligern, King, 186 note.
All Saints, festival of, 80.
Amalfi, its alliance with Rome, 92; treaty with John VIII., 184.
Ameria, 103.
Amiata, Monte, convent of, 414 note; codex of, 142–3 note.
Anastasia, S., titular ch., 29.
Anastasius III., Pope, 248.
Anastasius, S., Apostle of Hungary, 416.
Anastasius, Bibliothecarius, 148–50, 161 note.
Anastasius, Cardinal, 108, 115–6; usurps the Papacy, 117; banished, 118; amnestied, 156; excommunicated, 160.
Anathema, significance of, 197 and note.
Andrea e Gregorio, SS., ch., 292 note, 313.
Andrea e Bartolommeo, SS., convent, 30.
Andrew, S., on Soracte, monastery, 316.
Andrew of Bergamo, 514.
Angeli, S., *usque ad coelos*, 287–8.
Angelo, S., 97; condition in 10th cent., 286–7, 428; occupied by Crescentius, 425; taken by Otto III., 429.
Angelo, S., in Pescaria, ch., 29 note.
Anglo-Saxons, Schola of, 109.
Anio, name of, 179 note.
Anonymous of Ensiedeln, 517–20, 544.
Anonymous of Salerno, 145, 513, 521.
Anselm, Archbp. (818), 41.
Ansfried von Löwen, 334.
Anspert, Archbp., 175, 199, 201–2.
Apollinare, S., in Rome, ch. 553.
Apollinare, S., in Classe, ch., 26.
Apostoli, SS., ch., 215.
Aqua Claudia, 519, 531.
Aqua Jovia, 136.
  Sabatina, 81, 136.
  Trajana, 81, 136.
  Tuscia, 136 note.
Arca di Noë, 527 note.
Arch, Arches as fortresses, 542.
Arch of Camillus, 557.
  of Constantine, 542.
  of Janus, 543.
  of Titus, 519. *See also* Arcus.
Archangelus, S., diaconate, 29 and note.
Architecture, under the Carolingians, 25; of wood, 92.
Archives, of the Ch., 141–2.
Arcus Fabianus, 544.
  Manus Carneae, 558.
  Militorum, 432 note.
  Pietatis, 531, 556 note.
  Triumphalis, 542 note.
Arduin of Ivrea, 475.
Ardulf of Northumberland, 14, 15.
Arnulf, Emperor, 211, 212; ally of Formosus, 217; in Italy, 218, 219; besieges Rome, 220–1; crowned, 221; his retreat and illness, 223, 225, 233.
Arnulf, Bp. of Orleans, 404.
Arnulf, Bp. of Rheims, 404.
Arsenius of Eugubium, 115.
Arsenius of Horta, 135, 159.
Art in Rome, 28–9.
Artes, 297.
Ascensa Leonis Proti, 348 note.
Astarik, 477.
Atenulf of Benevento, 259, 269.
Athanasius, Bp. of Naples, 183, 184–5.
Attigny, Diet of, 43.
Atto, Bp. of Vercelli, 503, 508, 510.
Aurea, S., ch., 67.
Aurelius, M., statue of, 362, 398; column of, 548.
Austa, or l'Austa, 550.
Austald, Dux, 269.
Auxerre, battle of, 71.
Auxilius, 228, 507 note.
Aventine, palace of Otto III. on, 452, 487.

Azzo of Canossa, 322.
Azzo, Protoscriniar, 351, 357.

Bacchus, S., 544.
Balbina, S., titular ch., 29.
Baldwin, Count, 130.
Baldwin of Monte Casino, 311.
Bardas, Emperor, 123, 146.
Bari, conquered by the Saracens, 87, 158; by Lewis II., 162, 164; by Basil I., 201.
Bartholomew, S., his remains, 75, 483 and note.
Bartolommeo, S., ch., 483.
Basil I., Emperor, 124, 164, 200, 201.
Basil II., Emperor, 392, 424.
Basilians, 390, 403.
Basilica Julia, 544.
Baths of Alexander, 533, 553.
Baths of Diocletian, 531 note.
Benedict, S., his remains, 73 note.
Benedict, S., ch., 440.
Benedict III., Pope, 115; his election, 115–7; ordination, 118; relations with Byzantium, 119; death, 120.
Benedict IV., 241.
Benedict V. (Grammaticus), 352; overthrown, 353; exiled, 354–7; his death, 357.
Benedict VI., 377, 384.
Benedict VII., 387, 388, 390, 393.
Benedict Campanino, 300, 304.
Benedict, Count and Rector, 358–60, 425, 436–7.
Benedict of Soracte, 318; his lament over Rome, 365–6, 425, 513, 524.
Benedictines, 307–8.
Beneficia, 191.
Benevento, 86.
Berengar of Friuli, 172, 176, 199, 212; King of the Lombards, 213; makes treaty with Lambert, 223; King a second time, 236; defeated by the Hungarians, 237; deprives Lewis III. of sight, 247; crowned Emperor, 265; at war with Rudolf of Burgundy, 272; his death, 273.
Berengar of Ivrea, marries Willa, 320; defeats Hugo, 320; King of Italy, 322; vassal of Otto I., 324; his wars, 331; conspires agst. Otto I., 339; brought to Bamberg, 350; his death, 370 and note.
Bernard, King of Italy, 15, 16, 17; in Rome, 23; accompanies Stephen IV. to France, 34; revolts, 39; blinded, 41; his death, 41.
Bernard, Duke of Septimania, 69.
Bernard, Count, 116.
Berno of Cluny, 310–1.
Bernward of Hildesheim, 484, 489, 490.
Bertha, wife of Adalbert of Tuscany, 276, 285.
Bertha, wife of Rudolf II., 319.
Bertha, daughter of Hugo, 305 note.
Bertharius of M. Casino, 145, 186 note.
Bibliothecarius, 141.
Bishops, their apartments sacked, 209; manner of life in 9th cent., 209; Suburbican, 343–4.
Boethius, works of, 512.
Boniface VI., Pope, 224–5.
Boniface VII., 384; driven to Byzantium, 385; returns to Rome, 396; his death, 398.
Boniface, Missionary in Prussia, 416.
Boniface of Lucca, 66 note.
Boniface of Tuscany, 218.
Boniface and Alexius, SS., monastery, 388, 403, 416 note, 478–9.
Bonifacius, S., diaconate, 29.
Borgo, 55; fire in 847, 55 note, 92.
Boris, King, 125–6.
Boso, Duke, 175, 178, 198; King of Provence, 199, 202, 211.
Boso of Tuscany, 285.
Bridges, of the Tiber, 559.
Bruno. *See* Gregory V.

Bulgamini, 344.
Bulgarians, conversion of, 124–9.
Burgus Saxonum, 55.

Caballi Marmorei, 378; Region, 531 note.
de Caballo Marmoreo, surname, 378–80.
Caballus Constantini, 362.
Caere, 436–8.
Caesar, Julius, legend concerning, 527.
Caesarius, 91, 93, 94.
Calcarius, 539.
Calixtus, S., Catacombs of, 49.
Camaldolesi, order of, 465 note.
Camera Apostolica, 455.
Camerino, Margrave of, 176, 178.
Camigliano, 557.
Campagna, land tenure in, 458–9; Counts of the, 300, 301 note.
Campo, Abbot, 314–5, 438.
Campus Agonis, 552.
S. Agathae, 531 and note.
Decennias, 530.
Kaloleonis, 532 and note, 547.
Martius, in 10th cent., 531, 533, 550.
Neronis, 432.
Campulus, 22, 34.
Cannapara, 300, 344, 381 and note.
Capitol, in 10th cent., 546; statues on, 521.
Capua, 68 note; awarded to the Ch., 174 note; amphitheatre of, 185 note.
Caput Africae, 561.
Caput Tauri, 532 note.
Cardinals, increasing power of, 108.
Carloman, son of Lewis II., 172; desires imperial crown, 193–4; death of, 201–2 note.
Casa Aurea, 454.
Casa di Crescenzio, 536.
Castel Mazzano, 313.
Cecilia, S., legend of, 49.
Cecilia, S., ch., 26 note; a titular, 29, 48, 49–50.
Centumcellae, 102. *See* Civita Vecchia.
Cervetri. *See* Caere.
Cesena, 458.
Charles the Great (*see* Vol. ii.), character of his empire, 1–7; sojourn in Rome, 7–9; negotiations with Irene, 12; receives Leo III., 13; divides the empire, 14; appoints Lewis co-regent, 16; his cosmopolitan position, 18; death, 18; bequests, 19; canonised, 20; legends concerning him, 21; his coins, 9; tomb visited by Otto III., 481 and note.
Charles II. the Bald, 69; resolves to conquer Italy, 172; crowned Emperor, 173; his donation to the Ch., 174; King of Italy, 175; attitude towards John VIII., 190; towards Italy, 191; death, 193–4.
Charles III. the Fat., 172; King of Italy and Emperor, 202; meeting with Marinus, 206; deposes Guido of Spoleto, 206; pardons him, 207; ratifies Stephen V., 208; deposed, 211; his death, 211.
Charles the Simple, 211.
Charles, son of Chas. the Gt., 13.
Charles, Duke of Lorraine, 404.
Christophorus, Cardinal, usurps the Papacy, 242, 243 note, 244.
Christophorus, Magister Militum, 116.
Chrysogonus, S. titular ch., 29.
Church, wealth of, 105–6; State of the, supremacy of Emperor over, 9, 59; frontiers of, under John VIII., 192–3; guaranteed by Lambert, 234; extended by Otto III., 476.
Ciciliano, 262.
Circe, Cape of, battle of, 182.
Circus Agonalis, 552.

Circus Flaminius, 519, 532, 533, 552, 559.
Circus Maximus, 519, 530, 542.
Città Leonina, 95–100.
City, plans of the, 520.
Civita Vecchia, conquered by the Saracens, 66; colonised afresh, 102; name, 103.
Civitas Leonina. *See* Città.
Clergy, barbarism of, in 10th cent., 145, 498–9; luxury of, 209–10.
Clivus Capitolinus, 545.
Cluny, monastery of, 310.
Codices, in 9th cent., 142–4 and notes; in 10th, 500.
Coinage, papal right of, 9, 193 note.
Coins, of Chas. the Gt., 9; in 9th cent., 109 note, 144–5 note; of Formosus, 218 note; John IX., 233 note; Sergius III., 248 note; Anastasius III., 248 note; Benedict IV., 248 note; John X., 281 note; Agapitas, 299 note; absence of papal, 409 note; from Benedict VII. to Leo IX., 409 note; of Alberic, 299 note.
Colonna family, origin of, 300.
Column of M. Aurelius, 548–9.
Column of Trajan, 547.
Comacchio, 458.
Comes Sacrosancti Palatii Lateranensis, 453.
Comites, 450, 453.
Conrad, King of Burgundy, 391.
Conrad, Duke of Lorraine, 324, 409 note.
Constantine VIII., Emperor, 267.
Constantine IX., Emperor, 392, 424.
Constantine Porphyrogenitus, 146, 470.
Constantine, Apostle of the Slavs, 125.
Constantine, Roman noble, 220, 223.
Constantina, 177.
Consul Romanorum, 253.
Consuls, under Otto III., 450.
Consulate, 11 note.
Convents in Rome, 30–2; convent schools, 140.
Corneto, 103 note.
Corsica, 36, 37 and note.
Corsicans, their convent in Rome, 31 note; settled in Portus, 101.
Cosimato, S., monastery, 268 note.
Cosma and Damiano, SS., ch., 29, 443 note.
Council of 869 (eighth Oecumenical), 161; of 877, 189; in S. Peter's, 232.
Counties in Italy, origin of, 450.
Crescentii family, 359, 378, 436.
Crescentius de Caballo Marmoreo, 344, 358, 378, 380–1.
Crescentius, Prefect of the city, 474.
Crescentius, Son of Benedict, 425, 436, 437.
Crescentius, John, Patricius, 360, 399, 400, 407; banishes John XV., 408, 409; end of his Patriciate, 412; does homage to Otto III., 414; his character, 499; conspires against Gregory V., 419–20; again Patricius, 422; procures election of Philagathus, 423; defies Otto III., 426; besieged, 429; legend concerning him, 429; his death, 431; grave, 433–4.
Crescentius de Theodora, 383; revolts against Benedict VI., 383; invested with Castrum Vetus, 459; his end, 385–6.
Croce, S., ch., 531.
Cross, the true, 133.
Curiosum, 517.
Curtabracca, 382 note.
Cyriacus, S., titular ch., 29.

Dagobert, Abbot, 316.
Daniel, Magister Militum, 109–11.
Dativi. *See* Judices.
Dauferius, 460.
Decarcones, 361, 530.
Decenniae, 530.
Decretals, Pseudo-Isidorian, 154–5 and note, 421.

Demetrius Meliosus, 301, 340, 344.
Diaconates, 29–30.
Docibilis, 185, 268.
Domains, imperial, 453–5 and notes.
Donus, 377 note.
Draco, 82.
Drogo, Bp. of Metz, 84, 86.
Dromons, 182.
Ducatus Romanus, 192.
Duces, their share in episcopal elections, 122; position in 9th cent., 447; outside Rome, 450.

Earthquake of 801, 11; of 847, 92.
Echempert, 145.
Eckhard of Meiszen, 429.
Education in 9th cent., 137–40.
Eginhard, 14.
Eleutherius, 159–60.
Elias, S., convent of, 311–2 and note.
Embroideries, manufacture of, 105.
Emperors, revenues of, 454.
Empire, decay of, 170, 174; restored by Otto I., 335–6.
Engelberga, Empress, 132, 160, 163, 167, 172, 176, 199, 202.
Epigraphy, 518.
Erasmus, S., convent, 313 and note.
Ermengard (Irmingard), dau. of Lewis II., 172, 198.
Este, family, ancestor of, 332.
Ethelbald, 130.
Ethelwolf, 109, 130.
Eugenius II., Pope, 56, 64; decree of, 139 and note.
Euphemia, Abbess, 245.
Euphemius, General, 66.
Eustachio, S., ch., 29, 533, 554; its quarrel with Farfa, 440; possessions, 553.
Eustachio, S., family, 556.
Eustachius, S., legend of, 554–7.
Eusebius, S., titular ch., 29.
Excommunication, consequences of, 160 note.
Exile, as punishment, 9.

Falerii, 344 note.
Farfa, monastery, privileges of, 44–5; lawsuit with the Pope, 45; Lothar's diploma concerning, 45 note; condition in 9th and 10th centuries, 260, 314–6; conquered by the Saracens, 260; under the Ottos, 438–40; quarrel with Count Benedict, 425, 436–8; with S. Eustachio, 440; with SS. Cosma and Damiano, 443 note; under Lombard law, 441–2; possessions in Rome, 553; history of, 439 and note.
Farold, 223.
Fasciola, titular ch., 28.
Felix, S., ch., 552.
Feriae, 136 note.
Ferrucius, 378, 384 and notes, 397.
Feudalism in the Campagna, 458–60.
Filioque, 124.
Fiscus, imperial, 453–5.
Fleet, papal, 93, 181.
Foderum, 455.
Forma Claudia, 530.
Formosus, Pope, as missionary, 126–7; sent to Chas. the Bald, 173; member of German party, 176; excommunicated, 177; in France, 198; rehabilitated, 206; elected Pope, 216; crowns Lambert of Spoleto, 217; summons Arnulf, 218; crowns him, 221; his death, 223; post-mortem trial, 225–6; burial, 230; vindicated, 232; condemned afresh, 244.
Forum Claudii, 344 note.
Romanum, 533, 543.
Romanum Magnum, Region, 377.
Trajanum, 546–7.
Francesca Romana, S., ch., 26 note, 106.
Franco, son of Ferrucius, 378. *See* Boniface VII.
Franco, Bp., 480.
Frascati, 107.
Fulco, Archbp., 213.

Fundi, Duchy, 268.
Fundus Draconis, 82 note.

Gadericus, Bp., 173.
Gaeta, makes treaty with Rome, 92.
Galeria, 81.
Gallina Alba, 399.
Garigliano, battle of the, 270.
Gastaldi, 450 and note.
Gates, in 10th cent., 98, 366.
Gaudentius, S., 415-6.
George, S., ch., 30.
George de Aventino, 177.
George of Ravenna, 122.
Gerbert, 463, 466, 510. *See* Sylvester II.
Germanus, S., his remains, 75.
Gero, Archbp., 376.
Gerold, Count, 23.
Gerung, 43.
Giovanni, S., de Malva, 525 note.
Giovanni, S., in Mica Aurea, 525 note.
Gisela, 172, 212.
Gisulf of Salerno, 330.
Glass, painting on, 120 note.
Gnesen, Archbpric. of, 480.
Grammaticus, 501.
Graphia, 470, 502, 517, 523.
Gratian, Consul, 358 note.
Gratian, Superista, 109, 111, 116.
Greek, study of, 140, 469-70; monks in Rome, 140.
Greeks, invade the Campagna, 185; their possessions in S. Italy, 37.
Gregoriopolis, 68.
Gregory IV., Pope, 65; founds New Ostia, 68; character of his rule, 68; acts as mediator between Lothar and his sons, 69-70; institutes festival of All Saints, 80; his bldgs., 81; care for the Campagna, 81; death, 82.
Gregory V., 409-10; crowns Otto III., 412; holds Synod, 413; character of his rule, 414, 420; flight, 420; in Pavia, 421; restored, 425; cedes Comacchio, Cesena and Ravenna, 458; his death, 462.
Gregory of the Aventine, 301.
Gregory de Cannapara, 300.
Gregory, Dux, 269.
Gregory, Greek admiral, 181.
Gregory, Magister Militum, 116.
Gregory, Nomenclator, 176-7.
Gregory of Tusculum, 472, 490, 491.
Grotta Ferrata, foundation of, 463 note.
Guaiferius of Salerno, 181, 182.
Guaimar of Salerno, 259.
Guard, imperial, 452.
Guido I., Duke of Spoleto, 90.
Guido II., brother of Lambert, 181; Duke, 203; deposed, 206; reinstated, 207; victorious over the Saracens, 211; his power, 212, 213; King of France, 213; of Italy, 213; Emperor, 214; appoints Lambert co-regent, 217; his death, 219.
Guido of Tuscany, 276, 278, 279, 283.
Gulielmus Bibliothecarius, 150 note.
Gunther of Cologne, 131, 134, 156 note.
Gunzo of Novara, 505 note.

Hadrian, villa of, 486.
Hatto, Bp., 332.
Hedwig of Swabia, 507.
Helena, S., her remains, 73; Cross of, 133.
Henry, Duke of Bavaria, 325, 482, 489, 490.
Heribert of Cologne, 492, 494.
Hermits, Hermitages, 465.
Hildebald, Bp., 410.
Hildebrand, Abbot, 314-5.
Hilduin of Treves, 134.
Hincmar of Rheims, 147.
History, Historians, 513-5.
Homines imperiales, 8.
Horrea, Region, 530 and note.
Horta, walls of, 103; marchiones of, 255 note.
Hortus Mirabilis, 546.

Houses, Roman, 535–7. *See also* Casa.
Hrodgarius, 502.
Hubert of Farfa, 441–3, 447–9.
Hugh Capet, 391, 404, 407, 464.
Hugo, Abbot, 425, 437–40.
Hugo of Provence, 235, 276; King of Italy, 277; his character, 283–4; deprives Lambert of sight, 285; marries Marozia, 286; Bertha, 319; flies from Rome, 290; besieges it, 303–4; relations with Byzantium, 319; makes Lothar co-regent, 319; besieges Rome, 319–20; struggle with Berengar, 320; renounces his claims, 321; death, 321 note.
Hugo, Margrave of Tuscany, 408, 476 note, 482, 489–90.
Hungarians, invade Italy, 236–7; conquer Pavia, 272; in the Campagna, 274; conversion of, 477.

Iconoclasts, 117 and note.
Ignatius, Patriarch, 123.
Ignorance in Rome in 9th cent., 145–7; in 10th, 497–501.
Imiza, 345 note, 506.
Imperiola, Peter, 345 and note.
Imperium, theory of Lewis II. concerning, 164–7; under the Ottos, 334–5.
Ingebald, 316, 358 note.
Ingiltrude, 130.
Ingoald, Abbot, 45.
Irene, Empress, 12.
Irmengard, wife of Lewis the Pious, 34, 41.
Irmengard, wife of Adalbert of Ivrea, 276–7.
Irmengard, wife of Lothar I., 43.
Ischia, 66 note.
Isidore of Seville, 154.
Italian language. *See* Lingua Volgare.

Januarius, S., his remains, 76.
Janus, son of Noah, 525.
Jews, Schola of, 472 note.
Joan, Pope, 111–4.
Johannes Diaconus, 150, 508.
Johannipolis, 187, 342.
John VIII., Pope, 171; crowns Chas. the Bald, 173; goes to Pavia, 175; brings Formosus to trial, 177; seeks aid agst. the Saracens, 178; equips a fleet, 181; defeats the Saracens, 182; flies to France, 184; his letters, 186; bldgs. 186–7; summons Council in Rome, 189; attitude towards Chas. the Bald, 190; holds Synod at Ravenna, 191; meets Chas. the Bald, 193; holds negotiations with Lambert, 194–5; prisoner in the Vatican, 196; escapes to France, 197; crowns Lewis the Stammerer, 198; makes treaty with Boso, 198; returns to Italy, 199; recognises Photius, 200; crowns Chas. the Fat, 202; his death, 203–4; character, 205.
John IX., 231; rehabilitates Formosus, 232; ratifies Lambert's election, 233; at Synod of Ravenna, 233; his death, 238.
John X., his past, 249–50, 259; crowns Berengar, 265; war with the Saracens, 262–7; forms league with princes of S. Italy, 266; his triumphal entry, 270–1; summons Hugo of Provence, 277; his imprisonment and death, 279.
John XI., his parentage, 254; raised to the Papacy, 283; a prisoner, 290; ratifies Theophylact, 305; death, 305.
John XII. (Octavian), 328; raised to the Papacy, 329; expedition against princes in the South, 330; summons Otto I., 331–2; conspires with Berengar, 340; his dissolute life, 330, 340; cited before the Synod, 343; deposed, 347; returns to Rome, 350; his revenge, 350; death, 351.
John XIII., 357; imprisoned, 359,

360; in Ravenna, 368; crowns Otto II., 368; bestows Palestrina on Stephania, 374; crowns Theophano, 376; his death, 397.
John XIV., 393, 397.
John XV., 398, 405–6; his avarice, 407; flight and death, 408.
John XVI., 422; Anti-Pope, 423; mutilated, 426; his end, 427.
John, son of Benedict, 425, 436.
John Cannaparius, 515.
John, Cardinal, 351.
John, Deacon, 83.
John, Deacon of Naples, 148.
John, Deacon of Venice, 513.
John of Farfa, 438.
John of Gaeta, 267, 268, 269.
John of Narni, 346, 358.
John, Patricius, 473.
John, Prefect (998), 440.
John, Archbp. of Ravenna (858), 121–3, 135.
John Zimisces, 375.
Judges, criminal, 449. *See also* Judices.
Judices, 242, 253; Palatini, 444; Dativi, 301, 446, 448; Romani, 446; Ordinari, 301.
Judith, wife of Lewis the Pious, 69.
Judith, daughter of Chas. the Bald, 130.

Kailo of Ravenna, 250.
Kaloleo, 300; Campus Kaloleonis, Region, 532 and note.
Keys of the Apostle's grave, 203 note.

Lacus Curtius, 545.
Lacus Trajanus, 408 note.
Lambert I., Duke of Spoleto, attacks Rome, 157; deposed, 169; reinstated, 181; supports John VIII. against the Saracens, 181; takes part agst. him, 188–9; attacks Rome, 196; excommunicated, 197; his death, 203.
Lambert II., becomes co-regent, 217; Emperor, 219; at war with Arnulf, 220; takes Pavia, 225; attends post-mortem synod, 225; his death, 235.
Lambert of Tuscany, 276, 283, 285.
Lando, Pope, 248.
Landulf I., Duke of Capua, 259, 269.
Landulf II., 330.
Lateran Basilica, fall of, 226; restored, 234, 245–7.
Lateran Palace, bldgs. of Nicholas I., 137; Oratory, 26; Synod of 863, 131.
Latin, in 9th cent., 146, 149.
Law, 58–62; of Justinian, 60; Lombard, in Farfa, 441; administration of, under Alberic, 300; under Otto III., 444–8.
Lawyers, 140.
Lazarus, painter, 119–20 and note.
Learning, decay of, 139–40; revival of, 509.
Leo III., Pope (*see* Vol. ii.); goes second time to Chas. the Gt., 13; revolts against him, 22–3; his death and character, 24; bldgs., 24–9; coins 144 note.
Leo IV., 91; forms alliance with seaports, 92; blesses the fleet, 93; builds walls, 95; the Leonine city, 97–100; restores Portus, 101; founds Leopolis, 102; his churches, 103–4; crowns Lewis II., 108; denounces Anastasius, 108; accused to the Emperor, 110; his death, 111; coins, 145 note.
Leo V., 242, 243 note, 244.
Leo VI., 282.
Leo VII., 306, 317.
Leo VIII., 348; flight, 350; deposed, 352; reinstated, 353; his privilegium, 356; death, 357.
Leo V., the Armenian, Emperor, 54.
Leo VI., the Philosopher, 146, 201.
Leo, Abbot of Farfa, 438.
Leo of M. Casino. *See* of Ostia.
Leo de Cazunuli, 344.
Leo, Nomenculator, 46.

Leo, Simplex, of S. Boniface, 403, 464, 498–9, 510.
Leo of Subiaco, 300.
Leo of Vercelli, 479 note.
Leo, S., fortress, 339, 340, 341.
Leopolis, 102.
Leucius, S., ch., 116, 121.
Lewis I., the Pious, Emperor, 16–7; sends Bernard to Rome, 23; crowned by the Pope, 34; ratifies privileges of the Ch., 35–8; his diploma, 36–8; appoints Lothar co-emperor, 39; punishes Bernard, 41; at Diet of Attigny, 43; sends Missi to Rome, 47; his second marriage, 69; sanctions partition of Empire, 70; quarrels with his sons, 69–70; his death, 71.
Lewis II., King of Italy, 71; sent to Rome, 83–4; crowned, 85; makes treaty with Siconolf, 86; crowned Emperor, 108; his tribunal, 110; attitude towards Benedict III., 118; sole Emperor, 119; procures election of Nicholas I., 120; in opposition to him, 132; in Rome, 132–5; at war with the Saracens, 158; besieges Bari, 162–4; letter to Basil, 164–5; taken prisoner by Adelchis, 168; crowned a second time, 169 note; his death, 171.
Lewis III. (the Blind), of Provence, 211; in Italy, 237–8; crowned Emperor, 241; deprived of sight, 247, 263, 265.
Lewis the Stammerer, King of France, 198, 202 and note.
Lewis, son of Lewis the Pious, 40, 41, 69.
Lewis of Germany, 70, 164, 172, 189, 190.
Lewis, son of Charles the Bald, 195.
Libellaria, 191.
Libellus de imperatoria potestate, 514 and note.
Liber Pontificalis, 148–9, 513, 515.
Libraries in 9th cent., 141–2.
Lingua Volgare, in 9th cent., 168 note; in 10th, 505, 513.
Liudolf, 331.
Liutgarda, 409 and note.
Liutprand of Cremona, 249, 284, 287, 331, 343, 357, 369; in Constantinople, 370–2; his writings, 508, 512, 513.
Liutward, Chancellor, 208.
Lombards, 40; Lombard names, 61, 254–5 note; characters, 143 and note.
Lorenzo, S., de Ascensa, ch., 348.
Lorenzo, S., in Damaso, ch., 29.
Lorenzo, S., in Lucina, 29.
Lothar I., Emperor, co-regent, 39; King of Italy, 42, 43; crowned, 43; decides between Farfa and the Pope, 45; again in Rome, 56; his constitution, 57–8; rebels, 69; sole Emperor, 71; quarrels with his brothers, 71; sends Lewis, King of Italy, to Rome, 83; becomes monk, 119; his death, 119; edict, 138–9 and note.
Lothar, son of Hugo, King of Italy, 319; marries Adelaide, 319; his death, 321–2.
Lothar of Lotharingia, his marriage, 130; decision of Nicholas I. regarding, 135; fresh offences, 161–2; his perjury, 163; death, 164.
Lucia, S., justa Orphea, ch., 30.
Lucia, S., Renati, ch., 31, 531.
Lucia, S., in Septa Solis, 30, 541.
Luigi, S., dei Francesi, ch., 553.
Lupus de Ferrierès, 142.
de Lutara, convent, 31.
Lycaonia, 483.

Macell de' Corvi, 558.
Maginfred, Count, 235.
Magister Palatii imperialis, 452.
Majolus of Cluny, 387.
Mansionarii Scholae, etc., 134.
Manuscripts. *See* Codices.
Marcellus, S., titular ch., 29.
Marcellinus, S., remains of, 73.
Marchio, Marchiones, 255 note.

Marco (Marcus), S., ch., 80–1.
Marco, S., in Venice, 75 note.
Marforio, 545. *See also* Salita.
Maria, S., in Adriano, ch., 30.
Maria, S., Ambrosii, 32.
Maria, S., in Aquiro, 30.
Maria, S., Antiqua, 30, 106.
Maria, S., in Aracoeli, 546.
Maria, S., on the Aventine, convent of, 312.
Maria, S., in Augusta, ch., 551.
Maria, S., in Campo Marzo, 32.
Maria, S., in Cannapara, 381 note.
Maria, S., in Capitolio, 32, 546.
Maria, S., in Cosmedin, 26 note, 30, 137.
Maria, S., in Domnica, 26 note, 30, 48, 54. *See also* in Navicella.
Maria, S., Egiziaca, 561.
Maria, S., of Farfa, 553.
Maria, S., Liberatrice, 545.
Maria, S., sopra Minerva, 557.
Maria, S., in Navicella, 48, 55.
Maria, S., Nova, 106, 137.
Maria, S., in Pallara, 541.
Maria, S., in Posterula, 551 note.
Maria, S., in Sinikeo, 532.
Maria, S., supra Scholam Saxonum, 104.
Maria, S., in Trastevere (titular ch.), 29.
Maria, S., juxta Thermas, 440, 553.
Maria, S., in Via Lata, 30.
Marinus I., Pope, 205–6, 227.
Marinus II., 318, 321.
Mark, S., his remains, 75.
Marmorata, 559.
Marozia, her intrigue with Sergius III., 244, 254; marries Alberic, 256; Guido, 278; takes John X. a prisoner, 279; her influential position, 278, 283; marries Hugo, 286; a prisoner, 290; her end, 296.
Martina, S., in Augusta, ch., 551.
Martino, S., in Montibus, 91 note.
Matilda, dau. of Otto I., 391, 393, 480.
Mausoleum of Augustus, 531, 550–1.
Mazzolinus, Dux, 487.
Memoria Caesaris, 527.
Mercurius, Magister Militum, 115, 116.
Meta, 552.
Methodius, Apostle of the Slavs, 125.
Metz, Synod of, 131.
Michael, Emperor, 119, 123, 124, 146.
Michele, S., in Sassia, 104.
Milan, flourishing condition of, 40.
Militia, Roman, under Alberic, 298; banner of, 264 note.
Miniatures, illuminated, 143–4.
Minturnae, 186.
Mirabilia, 517, 521, 529.
Misenum, 87.
Missus, Missi, 8, 9, 58, 234.
Mitre, papal, 154 note.
Monasticism, decay of, 307–10; reform of, 310–6.
Monks in Rome, in 10th cent., 32.
Mons Augustus, 550.
  Gaudii, 432.
  Malus, 432 and note.
  Pinzi, 552.
Monte Casino, flourishing condition of, 145, 147, 163; burnt by the Saracens, 186 and note; its colonies, 308 note; reformed, 311.
  Gargano, 462–3.
  Mario, 432. *See also* Mons Malus.
Monuments, 537–9.
Mosaic Art, 28.
Mouson, Synod of, 464.

Names, in Italy, 61; Byzantine, 251; Arabic, 262 note; Lombard, 254–5 note; Roman in 10th cent., 251, 381–2; double, 433 note.
Naples, in alliance with Rome, 92.
Naumachia, 27 and note.
Navy, papal, 181.
Nereus and Achilleus, SS., ch., 26 note, 28, 29.
Niccolo, S., de Calcario, 539 note.

Niccolo, S., de Cesarini, ch., 539 note.
Niccolo alla Colonna (ad Columpnam Trajanum), 547.
Nicephorus, Emperor, 12, 125 note.
Nicephorus Phocas, 369–72.
Nicholas I., Pope, 120; dispute with John of Ravenna, 121–3; condemns Photius, 123–4; sends missionaries to the Bulgarians, 124; his Responsa, 127; convenes Synod of Metz, 131; quarrels with Lewis II., 132; mediates between Lothar and his wife, 135; his bldgs., 136–7; encouragement to learning, 138; correspondence with the Emp. Michael, 146; founder of papal monarchy, 153; his death, 155.
Nicholas of Anagni, 115, 116.
Nicholas Picingli, 267, 269.
Nilus, S., 403, 427; visited by Otto III., 463; founds Grotta Ferrata, 463 note.
Nigellus, Ermold, 147.
Noah, legendary founder of Rome, 525–6.
Nobility, Roman, in 10th cent., 291; legendary pedigrees of, 556.
Notitia, 517–9.
Numentanum, 399.
Nymphaeum, 519.

Octavian, 325. *See* John XII.
Octavius Mamilius, 556.
Odo of Cluny, 284, 304, 311; reforms the Roman monasteries, 311–3; Farfa, 315, 319; his culture, 509.
Odo, Count of Paris, 211.
Optimates, as judges, 301, 447.
Ordinarii. *See* Judices.
Organs, 49 note.
Orso de Baro, 383 note.
Otbert, 332.
Otger, Bp., 351, 357.
Otto I., Emperor, 320; invited to Italy, 322–3; marries Adelaide, 323; 1st expedition to Italy, 323–4; 2nd, 332; coronation, 334; charter, 337–8; again in Rome, 341; deprives Romans of right of papal election, 342; his synods, 343; battle with the Romans, 349; restores Leo VIII. to papal throne, 353; besieges Rome, 353; returns to Germany, 357; again in Rome, 360; sends Liutprand to Constantinople, 369; his death, 378.
Otto II., 332; crowned, 368; marries Theophano, 376; in Rome, 391; wars in S. Italy, 392; his death, 394; grave, 394–5.
Otto III., King of Germany, 393; in Italy, 408; raises Bruno to the Papacy, 409; crowned Emperor, 412; holds Council, 413; returns to Germany, 416; again in Rome, 425; besieges Crescentius, 428–9; his court, 452–3, 469–74; pilgrimage to Campania, 461; raises Gerbert to the Papacy, 463, 466; his ideals, 467; attitude to the Pope, 475; donations to him, 476; fortress on the Aventine, 478; his mysticism, 479; goes to Germany, 480; returns to Rome, 482; builds ch. of S. Adalbert, 482–4; war with Tivoli, 487; revolt of Romans agst., 488–9; his flight, 490; in Ravenna and Venice, 491; marches agst. Rome, 492; his death, 493; character, 495; his monument to Boethius, 512.
Otto, Duke of Lorraine, 482, 494.

Painting, 28.
Palata, 66.
Palatinate, imperial, in Rome, 451–2.
Palatine, Region, 540.
Palatine imperial palace, 7; in 10th cent., 540.
Palatium, meaning of, 523–4.
Palatium Monasterium, 478–9 and note.

Palatium Neronis, 519 note.
Palatium Pilatii, 519 note.
Palestrina (Praeneste), 373; bestowed on Stephania, 374.
Palimpsests, 500.
Pammachius, S., ch., 29.
Pancrazio, S., ch., 433.
Pandulf II. of Benevento, 330.
Pandulf III. (the Ironhead) of Capua, 185, 360, 368, 385.
Panegyricus Berengarii, 263 note.
Pantheon, legend concerning, 522.
Paolo, S., *fuori le mura*, roof of, destroyed, 11 note; sacked by the Saracens, 89; enriched by Leo IV., 105; monastery of, reformed, 311.
Papacy, in 9th cent., 152–3; invective agst., 404–6.
Papal election, Emperor's consent necessary to, 33 note, 35, 62, 232; decision of Lothar I. concerning, 62; decree of Adrian III., 207; decision of Council of 898, 234; of Otto I., 342–3; Privilegium of Leo VIII., 356 and note; Papal Court, depravity of, 256.
Parione, Region, 558; tower, 558.
Paschalis I., Pope, 35; crowns Lothar, 43; quarrels with Farfa, 44; puts Theodore and Leo to death, 46; takes oath of purgation, 47; his death, 48; portraits, 48; bldgs., 48–55.
Paschalis, nephew of Adrian I. (*see* Vol. ii.), 22, 34.
Passion plays in 9th cent., 503.
Patricius, in 10th cent., 267, 292, 400; under Otto III., 473.
Patrimony of the Ch., alienation of, forbidden, 192–3; converted into feudal estates, 457.
Patrimonium Appiae, 192.
Patrimonium Campaninum, 192.
Patrimonium Labicanense, 192.
Patrimonium Theatinum, 192.
Patrimonium Tusciae, 192.
Paul of Populonia, 126.
Paulinus of Nola, 483.
Paulus Diaconus (*see* Vol. ii.), 145.
Pavia, Diet of, 172; conquered by the Hungarians, 272; Council of, 421; University of, 138.
Pellegrino, S., ch., 27.
Penitents, 78–80.
Pensio, 455.
Peregrinus, S., 27.
Peter, S., basilica of, sacked by the Saracens, 87–8; restored by Leo IV., 104; by Formosus, 223; adorned by Leo III., 26.
Peter's Pence, 109 and note.
Peter, Abbot of Farfa, 261.
Peter, brother of John X., 264, 278–9.
Peter Imperiola, 345 and note.
Peter of Pavia. *See* John XIV.
Philagathus, 422. *See* John XVI.
Photius, Patriarch, 123; condemned, 124; his learning, 145–6; recognised by John VIII., 200; condemned by Marinus, 205–6.
Phrygium, 154 note.
Piacenza, Archbpric. of, 422.
Piazza Navona, 533, 552.
Pigna, Region, 551 note.
Pilate, 519 note.
Pilgrimages, pilgrims, 76–8.
Pine-cone, bronze, 55 note.
Pipin, son of Chas. the Gt. (*see* Vol. ii.), 11; King of Italy, 14; his death, 15.
Pipin, son of Lewis the Pious, 31, 41, 69.
Piscina publica, Region, 533.
Placita, 8, 441 note.
Plumarium opus, 105 note.
Poetry in 10th cent., 508.
Pons Fabricius, 560.
  Judaeorum, 560.
  Probi (Theodosii) in Riparmea, 560.
  Vaticanus, 287–8.
Ponte Corvo, 158 note.
  S. Maria, 559, 560.
  de' quattro Capi, 560.

Ponte Rotto, 559.
Sisto, 560.
Pontigon (Ponthion), Diet of, 175, 177 note.
Popes, position of under Chas. the Gt., 10; apartments sacked, 208–9; largesse on their elevation, 210; change their names, 83 note; revenues in 9th cent., 106; in 10th, 457; catalogue of, 149 and note.
Porta S. Agathae, 551 note.
Castelli, 97, 98.
Cavaleggieri, 98 note.
Fabrica, 98 and note.
Flaminia, 551.
Maggiore, 531.
Melonaria, 98.
Metrovia, 530.
Palatii, 97.
Peregrini, 97 and note, 99.
Pertusa, 98 and note.
S. Petri in Hadrianeo, 98 note.
Pigna, 551.
del Popolo, 532, 551.
S. Spirito, 98 and note.
del Torrione, 98 and note.
S. Valentini, 97, 532.
Viridaria, 97, 98 note.
Portico of S. Peter's, 55 note, 92, 104, 192.
Portus, decay of, 101; rebuilt, 101, 137.
Posterula S. Agathae, 532, 551 note.
S. Angeli, 97 note.
de Episcopo, 551 note.
a Pigna, 551 note.
Saxonum, 98 note.
Praefectus Navales, 472.
Urbis, 359, 474.
Praestaria, 191.
Praetextatus, cemetery of, 50.
Prassede (Praxedis), S., ch., 29, 48; restored, 52–4; chapel of S. Zeno in, 53.
Prata Decii, 530.
Precaria, 191.
Prefect. *See* Praefectus.
Primicerius, 444.
Princeps, title of, 292, 303.
Privata Mamertini, 545.
Privilegia, restoration of, 35.
Protoscriniar, 444.
Protospatharius, 473.
Prussia, conversion of, 415.
Pudens, S., ch., 29.
Pulcharius of Amalfi, 181.
Puteus Dominae Probae, 532 note.

Quattro Coronati (Quattuor Coronatorum), ch., 29, 106, 530.
Quirinal, 531.

Radelchis of Benevento, 86–7.
Radoald of Portus, 116; in favour of Photius, 123; in Metz, 131.
Ratherius, 498 note, 507, 510.
Ravenna, residence of Berengar, 325; palace of Otto in, 373 note; Archbpric. of, acquires Comacchio, Cesena and Ravenna, 458; Synod of 877, 192; of 898, 233–4.
Reginhar, 41.
Regions, in 10th cent., 529–34.
Relics, traffic in, 72–6.
Rheims, Synod of 991, 404; of 995, 407, 498.
Richilda, wife of Chas. the Bald, 175, 179.
Ripa Graeca, 559.
Ripaticum, 193 note.
S. Riquier, library of, 141.
Robert of France, 475.
Roffred, Abbot, 314.
Roffred, Count, 359, 360.
Romagna, name, 45 note.
Romanus II., Emperor, 305.
Romanus, Pope, 230.
Romanus, Bp., 117.
Rome, under Chas. the Gt., 2–6; Caput Mundi, 449, 471 note; Aurea Urbs, 525; legend of her foundation, 526–7; description of, in 9th and 10th cents., 516–28.
Romescot, 109 note.
Romuald, S., 465–6, 492.
Roswita, 502, 507.

Rothilda of Tuscany, 196.
Rudolf of Burgundy, 211–2, 272, 276, 277.

Sabina, S., titular ch., 29.
Sabina, province, 192; acquired by Alberic, 316; rectors of, 316; comites of, 438 note.
Saccellarius, 444.
Saints, as patrons of cities, 75 note; traffic in their remains, 72–6.
Salita di Marforio, 348.
Salvatio Romae, 521 note.
Salvatore, S., ad duos amantes, 557.
Salvatore, S., in Thermis, 553–4.
Saracens, conquer Sicily, 66–7; Misenum, 87; sack S. Peter's, 87–8; S. Paul's, 89; defeated, 90, 94; their traffic with Rome, 105; devastate the Campagna, 178–9; intercourse with Italy, 180; defeated by John VIII., 182; negotiations with him, 184; settle on the Garigliano, 186; take Syracuse, 201; Farfa and Subiaco, 261; defeated by John X., 270; at war with Benedict VII., 391.
Saracinesco, 261–2.
Sardinia, 37, 38 and notes; Sardinian convent in Rome, 31 note.
Schism, Greek, 123.
Schola Confessionis S. Petri, 134.
Schola of the Greeks, 264.
Scholastica, S., convent, 388.
Schools, in 9th cent., 138, 140; in 10th, 499, 506.
ad Scorticlarios, 533.
Sculpture, 28–9.
Sebastiano, S., convent, 137.
Sebastiano, S., in Palladio, 541.
Secundicerius, 444.
See, vacancy of, 157.
Sella stercoraria, 112 and note.
Senate, imperial, extinction of, 122 note, 293–4.
Senator Romanorum, 254, 293.
Senatrix, 254, 295.
Senior, meaning of, 295 note.
Septem Viis, 541.
Septizonium, 519, 530, 541.
Sepulcrum Caesaris, 527–8 and note.
Sergius II., Pope, 83; receives Lewis II., 84; crowns him, 85; his death, 91.
Sergius III., in revolt agst. Formosus, 217, 220; candidate for the Papacy, 231; his character, 243–5; rebuilds the Lateran, 245–7; relations with Marozia, 244; his death, 248.
Sergius II., Duke of Naples, 182–3.
Sergius, Bp. of Damascus, 390.
Sergius, Magister Militum, 177.
Sergius, Bp. of Nepi, 313.
Sergius and Bacchus, SS., convent, 30, 544.
Severus, Bp. of Ravenna, 74 note.
Sicard of Benevento, 75–6, 86.
Sicily, under the Saracens, 66–7.
Sico, Bp., 348, 351.
Siconolf, 86.
Silva Candida, Bpric., 90, 245.
Silvestro, S., in Capite, ch., 532, 549.
Silvestro, S., in Lacu Curtii, 545 note.
Sisto e Domenico, SS., 245 note.
Sisto, S., in Via Appia, 245 note.
Slaves, 94.
Spoleto, rights of Duke of, during vacancy of papal throne, 157.
Stadium Domitiani, 550, 552.
Statius, knowledge of, 508.
Statues, burnt for lime, 539; sounding, 521.
Stefano, S. (Stephen), convent, 28.
Stefano, S., delle Carozze, ch., 561.
Stefano e Ciriaco, SS., convent, 314.
Stefano, S., in Piscinula, 478.
Stefano, S., degli Ungari, 478.
Stephania, wife of Adrian II., 160.
Stephania, wife of Crescentius. *See* Theodora.
Stephania, Senatrix, 295, 301 note, 358, 374.
Stephen IV., Pope, 33; crowns Lewis the Pious, 34; ratifies

privilegia of Farfa, 45; his death, 34.
Stephen V., his election, 208; demands aid agst. the Saracens, 211; crowns Guido of Spoleto, 214; his death, 215.
Stephen VI., 225; holds post-mortem synod, 225; his death, 229.
Stephen VII., 282.
Stephen VIII., 317–8.
Stephen (the Saint), King of Hungary, 477–8.
Stephen de Imiza, 344, 382.
Stephen Secundicerius, 177.
Stephen Vestiarius, 359, 364.
Stephen, Roman noble, 220, 223.
Stilo, battle of, 392.
Streets, in 10th cent., 534.
Sub Capitolio, Region, 377, 533.
Subiaco, bldgs. of Leo IV. at, 107; destroyed by Saracens, 261; convent acquires Castrum Sublacense, 312–3.
Subura, 532 and note.
Susanna, S., titular ch., 29.
Sylvester II., *see* Gerbert; bestows Terracina in fief on Dauferius, 460; Pope, 466; relations towards Otto III., 475; counsels Tivoli to surrender, 487; present at Otto's death, 493; his studies, 510–2.
Sylvester and Martinus, SS., titular ch., 29, 30.
Synod, of 898, 231; of 963, 343; of 996, 413–4.
Syracuse, taken by the Saracens, 201.

Tammus, Count, 430, 493.
Tarquinia, 103.
Taxes, 457.
Temple of Aesculapius, 483.
Catiline, 544.
Concord, 544.
Fortuna Virilis, 560–1.
Rome and Venus, 106, 543.
Saturn, 546.
Vespasian, 546.
Temple of Vesta, 560.
Templum Concordia et Pietatis, 543, 544.
Templum Fatale, 543.
Latone, 544.
Refugii, 543.
septem Solia, 541.
Sibyllae, 561.
Terence, knowledge of, 502–3.
Terracina, a papal fief, 460.
Theatre, 502–4.
Theatre of Marcellus, 381, 559.
of Pompey, 519, 558.
Theatrum, meaning of, 523–4.
Theatrum Antonini, 559.
Theodora I., Senatrix, 244; raises John X. to papal throne, 249; her personality, 250–2, 254.
Theodora II., Senatrix, 254, 258 note, 358 note.
Theodora, wife of John Crescentius, 433 note, 493.
Theodoranda, 358 and note.
Theodore II., Pope, 230.
Theodore, Primicerius, 35, 46.
Theodore de S. Rufina, 344.
Theodorus, S., ch., 30.
Theophano, Empress, 362; marries Otto II., 376, 391; regent, 396; in Rome, 401; her death, 407; learning, 507.
Theophylact, Greek admiral, 181.
Theophylact, Consul and Dux, 244, 251 and note, 252, 256; fights agst. the Saracens, 267, 269.
Theophylact, Patriarch, 305.
Thermae. *See* Baths.
Theutgaud of Treves, 131–2; amnestied, 156; death of, 156 note.
Thiodulf, Bp. of Orleans, 41.
Thiutberga, 130, 135, 161.
Thymelici, 502.
Tiara, papal, 154 note.
Tiber, inundation of, 119; island in, 482.
Tituli, 'titulars' under Leo III., 29; represented at Synod of Otto I., 344.

Tivoli, name, 485 ; Bpric. of, 487.
Torre del Quinto, 121.
Towers, of churches, 366 note, 519 note.
Traetto, 183 ; Counts of, 268–9 note.
Trastevere, Region, 534, 562.
Tres Tabernae, Bpric., 344 note.
Trevi, 532.
Tribunes, in 10th cent., 450–1 note.
Tribur, Diet of 887, 211.
Trifomena, S., 76.
Trifon, S., in Posterula, ch., 554.
Trosle, Council of, 273.
Troyes, Synod of, 198.
Trullus, 552 and note.
Turpin of Rheims, 21.
Turris Neronis, 552 note.
Tusculum, Bp. of, 344 note.

Urseolus, Peter, I., Doge, 465.
Urseolus, Peter, II., 491.
Umbilicus Romæ, 519.

Valentine I., Pope, 65.
Valentine, S., ch., 238 note.
Valerian, S., 49–51.
Venice, prosperity of, 491.
Vercelli, 479 note.
Verdun, treaty of, 71.
Via della Botteghe Oscure, 538 note.
Lata, 300, 519, 532, 562.
Magnanapoli, 547.
Merulana, 531.
Pontificalis, 534.
Via Sacra, 543, 545.
Triumphalis, 432.
Vilgard, 506.
Viminal, 531.
Vincenzo, S., a Volturno, monastery, 186.
Vineae Tedemarii, 539 note.
Virgil, knowledge of, 507, 508.
Vitalis, S., titular ch., 29.
Vitus, S., in Macello, 30.

Waimar (Guaimar) III. of Salerno, 259.
Wala, 16, 43.
Walbert, Archbp. of Milan, 332.
Waldrada, 130, 135, 162, 276.
Walls, Aurelian, restored by Leo IV., 95, 111 ; Leonine, 97.
Walwisindula, 177.
Welf, Duke of Bavaria, 69.
Willa, wife of Berengar, 320, 331, 340, 350.
William of Provence, 391.
William of Aquitaine, 310.
Willigis, Archbp. of Mainz, 408, 410.
Winichis, Duke of Spoleto, 24.
Wolf, Capitoline, 364.
Worms, Diet of, 207.

Zacharias of Anagni, 123.
Ziadet-Allah, 66.
Ziazo, Patricius, 473, 480, 493.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH.

Property of
WILLIAM and FLORA RICHARDSON
LIBRARY